



# HONOLULU RAIL TRANSIT PROJECT

## FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION and AMENDED RECORD OF DECISION



**HART**  
HONOLULU AUTHORITY for RAPID TRANSPORTATION

 U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Transit Administration

SEPTEMBER 2013

AR00153853



**Honolulu Rail Transit Project**  
(formerly the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project)  
City and County of Honolulu, O'ahu, Hawai'i

**Final Supplemental Environmental Impact  
Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation and Amended  
Record of Decision**

Submitted pursuant to Title 42 USC 4332(2)(c), Title 49 USC 303, Title 49 USC Chapter 53, 49 CFR 622.101, 23 CFR 774, 23 CFR 771, and the Judgment and Partial Injunction of the United States District Court for the District of Hawai'i in *HonoluluTraffic.com, et al., vs. Federal Transit Administration, et al.*, Civ. No. 11-00307 AWT.

This Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation and Amended Record of Decision document has been prepared pursuant to Pub. L. 112-141, 126 Stat. 405, Section 1319(b).

*by the*

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration


Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation


**SEP 30 2013**

Date of Approval

9/30/13

Date of Approval

  
Regional Administrator  
Federal Transit Administration  
U.S. Department of Transportation

  
Executive Director and CEO  
Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation  
City and County of Honolulu

The following persons may be contacted for additional information concerning this document:

Mr. Ted Matley  
FTA Region IX  
201 Mission Street, Suite 1650  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 744-3133

Mr. Daniel A. Grabauskas  
Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation  
City and County of Honolulu  
1099 Alakea Street, Suite 1700  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
(808) 768-6159





## ***Abstract***

---

This Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation [EIS/4(f)] and Amended Record of Decision (ROD) for the Honolulu Rail Transit Project is a limited-scope document that evaluates the prudence and feasibility of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative and reconsiders the no use determination for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park. This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) was prepared to address the Judgment and Partial Injunction of the United States District Court for the District of Hawai'i in *HonoluluTraffic.com, et al., vs. Federal Transit Administration, et al.*, Civ. No. 11-00307 AWT. The Judgment, filed on December 27, 2012 requires the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the City and County of Honolulu to comply with the District Court's Summary Judgment Order dated November 1, 2012.

The FTA is the lead federal agency and the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation is the project sponsor for the 20-mile rail transit project that extends from Kapolei to Ala Moana Center, via the Honolulu waterfront. This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) addresses agency and public comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) and documents consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer regarding traditional cultural properties.

The FTA has issued an Amended ROD, which amends the ROD previously issued in January 2011. The ROD has been supplemented with a section pertaining to this Supplemental EIS/4(f). The findings made in the January 2011 ROD, however, are unaltered, except where the Amended ROD expressly alters them.

A disk containing the Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) is available at no cost. The document is available on the project website at [honolulutransit.org](http://honolulutransit.org) and may be viewed at the following locations:

City and County of Honolulu Municipal Library

All O'ahu public libraries

Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation, 1099 Alakea Street, Suite 1700

Printed copies of the document are available for purchase.



# Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
1 Background, Purpose and Need.....	7
1.1 Purpose and Scope of this Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation.....	7
1.2 Section 4(f) Background .....	8
1.2.1 Section 4(f) Uses .....	9
1.2.2 Prudent and Feasible Avoidance Alternatives .....	11
1.2.3 Least Overall Harm .....	13
1.3 Environmental Review Process .....	13
1.4 Purpose and Need.....	14
1.4.1 Purpose of the Project .....	14
1.4.2 Need for Transit Improvements .....	14
2 Alternatives Considered .....	17
2.1 Alternative Evaluation .....	17
2.2 Description of the Project.....	17
2.3 Content of the Final EIS/4(f) being Supplemented.....	19
3 Evaluation of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .....	21
3.1 Description of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .....	21
3.2 Section 4(f) Properties .....	32
3.3 Use of Section 4(f) Properties by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.....	39
3.3.1 O'ahu Rail and Land Parcel .....	40
3.3.2 McKinley High School .....	43
3.3.3 King Florist.....	45
3.3.4 Temporary Occupancy.....	47
3.3.5 Summary of Use of Section 4(f) Properties by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .....	47
3.4 Evaluation of Feasibility .....	47
3.5 Evaluation of Prudence.....	49
3.5.1 Effectiveness at Meeting Purpose and Need.....	49
3.5.2 Safety and Operational Considerations .....	52
3.5.3 Social, Economic, Environmental, and Community Impacts .....	52
3.5.4 Costs of an Extraordinary Magnitude.....	65
3.5.5 Unique Problems or Unusual Factors .....	67
3.5.6 Cumulative Consideration of Factors .....	67
3.6 Overall Feasibility and Prudence of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.....	68
3.7 Least Overall Harm.....	68
3.7.1 The Ability to Mitigate Adverse Impacts on each Section 4(f) Property (including any measures that result in benefits to the property) .....	69

3.7.2	The Relative Severity of the Remaining Harm, after Mitigation, to the Protected Activities, Attributes, or Features that Qualify Each Section 4(f) Property for Protection.....	69
3.7.3	The Relative Significance of Each Section 4(f) Property.....	72
3.7.4	The Views of the Official(s) with Jurisdiction over Each Section 4(f) Property .....	73
3.7.5	The Degree to which Each Alternative Meets the Purpose and Need of the Project .....	73
3.7.6	After Reasonable Mitigation, the Magnitude of any Adverse Impacts to Resources Not Protected by Section 4(f) .....	74
3.7.7	Substantial Differences in Costs among the Alternatives .....	74
3.7.8	Summary .....	75
4	Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground .....	77
4.1	Description of the Property .....	77
4.1.1	Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park Recreational Activities, Features, and Attributes Eligible for Protection under Section 4(f) .....	80
4.1.2	Historic Elements Eligible for Protection under Section 4(f) .....	84
4.1.3	Proposed Changes to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	87
4.2	Evaluation of Use of the Property .....	90
4.2.1	Evaluation of Direct Use .....	90
4.2.2	Evaluation of Constructive Use .....	94
4.2.3	Coordination with Agency with Jurisdiction .....	103
4.3	Alternatives to an Alignment Near Mother Waldron Playground .....	103
4.4	Summary of Use .....	104
5	Coordination and Comment.....	107
5.1	Agency Consultation.....	107
5.2	Public and Agency Comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) .....	108
5.2.1	Summary of Comments Related to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .....	108
5.2.2	Summary of Comments Related to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground.....	109
5.2.3	Summary of Revisions to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) in Response to Comments.....	109
5.2.4	Common Comments and Responses .....	110
	References.....	121
	List of Preparers.....	125
	List of Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) Recipients .....	127
	Index .....	135



## **Figures**

Figure 1. The Project.....	18
Figure 2. Project Schedule .....	19
Figure 3. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .....	22
Figure 4. Key to Figure 5 through Figure 12.....	23
Figure 5. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Ka'aahi Street Station.....	24
Figure 6. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Fort Street Station .....	24
Figure 7. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Alapai Street Station.....	25
Figure 8. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Pensacola Street Station .....	25
Figure 9. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Kalākaua Avenue Station .....	26
Figure 10. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative McCully Street Station .....	26
Figure 11. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Husten Street Station .....	27
Figure 12. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative UH Mānoa Station .....	27
Figure 13. Project Schedule for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .....	28
Figure 14. Avoidance Alternative Development at the Fort Street Station.....	29
Figure 15. Avoidance Alternative Development at the Kalākaua Avenue Station .....	30
Figure 16. Avoidance Alternative Development at the Husten Street Station.....	31
Figure 17. Historic and Recreational Properties Affected by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .....	33
Figure 18. Avoidance Alternatives Evaluated for the Ka'aahi Street Station .....	42
Figure 19. Avoidance Alternatives Evaluated for McKinley High School .....	44
Figure 20. Avoidance Alternatives Evaluated for King Florist.....	46
Figure 21. Example of a Tunnel Boring Machine .....	48
Figure 22. Typical Views along the South King Street Corridor.....	54
Figure 23. Significant Views Identified in Chapter 21 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu .....	55
Figure 24. View of Guideway from Thomas Square Looking Makai.....	55
Figure 25. Tunnel Portal and Tunnel Station Area Disturbance during Construction .....	62
Figure 26. Section 4(f) Use by the Project in the Chinatown Area .....	71
Figure 27. Section 4(f) Use by the Project in the Downtown Area.....	71
Figure 28. Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park Vicinity.....	78
Figure 29. Original Mother Waldron Playground and Current Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park Boundaries .....	79
Figure 30. Existing Views from Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park.....	81
Figure 31. 1952 USGS Aerial Photograph of Mother Waldron Playground and Surrounding Area .....	82
Figure 32. Significant Historic Features of Mother Waldron Playground .....	86
Figure 33. Existing and Simulated Future Land Use adjacent to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	88

Figure 34. Site Plan for Proposed Development Adjacent to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	88
Figure 35. Proposed 690 Pohukaina Street Project .....	89
Figure 36. Forrest City Proposed Site Plan for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park Programming .....	90
Figure 37. Detail of Honolulu Rail Transit Project in Relation to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	91
Figure 38. Existing View and Simulation of Elevated Guideway in Relation to the Mauka Boundary of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	93
Figure 39. Existing View and Simulation Near Elevated Guideway from within Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	97
Figure 40. Existing View and Simulation Showing Elevated Guideway from Area of Frequent Use within Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	98
Figure 41. Moanalua Community Park .....	100
Figure 42. Queen Street Shift Alternative Evaluated to Reduce Impacts to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	105

## **Tables**

Table 1. Publicly Owned Park and Recreational Properties Adjacent to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .....	35
Table 2. National Register of Historic Places Eligible or Listed Properties Evaluated for Section 4(f) Use .....	36
Table 3. Effectiveness in Improving Corridor Mobility.....	50
Table 4. Effectiveness of Alternatives in Improving Corridor Travel Reliability.....	51
Table 5. Equity Comparison of 2030 Transit Travel-time Savings Compared to the No Build Alternative.....	52
Table 6. Parklands Koko Head of Ka'aahi Street Station .....	56
Table 7. Affected Properties Listed in or Determined Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places .....	57
Table 8. Affected Properties Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places* .....	58
Table 9. Capital Costs Excluding Finance Charges .....	66
Table 10. Standard Cost Categories Comparison of Alternatives Koko Head of Iwilei (2006 \$M).....	66
Table 11. Comparison of Remaining Harm Between Alternatives.....	70
Table 12. Summary of Least Overall Harm .....	75
Table 13. Permitted Uses and Events at Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park (2009–2012).....	83
Table 14. Observed Use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	83
Table 15. Noise Data for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park .....	95
Table 16. Observed Use of Moanalua Community Park .....	100
Table 17. Capital Costs Excluding Finance Charges for Additional Options .....	111
Table 18. Consideration of Effectiveness of Shortening the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .....	112

## ***Appendices (on enclosed compact disk)***

---

- Appendix A—Comments and Responses on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation
- Appendix B—Judgment and Partial Injunction of the United States District Court in *HONOLULUTRAFFIC.COM, et al., vs. FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, et al.*
- Appendix C—Order on Cross-motions for Summary Judgment of the United States District Court in *HONOLULUTRAFFIC.COM, et al., vs. FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, et al.*
- Appendix D—Correspondence
- Appendix E—Section 4(f) Evaluation of Previously Unidentified Traditional Cultural Properties for the Honolulu Rail Transit Project
- Appendix F—Amended Record of Decision



## ***Acronyms and Abbreviations***

---

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
City	City and County of Honolulu
dBA	A-weighted decibels
District Court	United States District Court for the District of Hawai'i
HDOH	Hawai'i Department of Health
DBEDT	State of Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism
DOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
DPP	City and County of Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting
DPR	City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation
DTS	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services
EIS	environmental impact statement
EIS/4(f)	Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation
‘Ewa	toward the ‘Ewa plain, generally west
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
HART	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation
HCDA	Hawai'i Community Development Authority
HECO	Hawaiian Electric Company
Koko Head	toward Koko Head, generally east
Leq	equivalent sound level
Leq(h)	hourly-equivalent sound level
Makai	toward the ocean
Mauka	toward the mountains
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OR&L	O‘ahu Railway & Land Co.
ORTP	<i>O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan</i>
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PUC	Primary Urban Center
ROD	Record of Decision

RTD	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services, Rapid Transit Division
SCC	standard cost categories
SHPD	State Historic Preservation Division
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
TBM	tunnel boring machine
TCP	traditional cultural property
TPSS	Traction Power Substation
UH Mānoa	University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
USC	United States Code
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
VdB	vibration decibels
YOE	year of expenditure

## ***Executive Summary***

---

In January 2011, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project [now called the Honolulu Rail Transit Project (the Project)], which is a 20-mile rail transit project that extends from Kapolei to Ala Moana Center, via the Honolulu waterfront. This alternative is referred to as the Project. The Project would use four Section 4(f) properties: OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building property, Chinatown Historic District, the Dillingham Transportation Building, and the Hawaiian Electric Company (HECO) Downtown Plant/Leslie A. Hicks Building. All four are historic properties.

This Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation [EIS/4(f)] was prepared to address the Judgment and Partial Injunction (Judgment) of the United States District Court for the District of Hawai'i (District Court) in *HonoluluTraffic.com, et al., vs. Federal Transit Administration, et al.*, Civ. No. 11-00307 AWT. The Judgment, filed December 27, 2012 requires the FTA and the City and County of Honolulu (City) to comply with the District Court's Order on Cross-motions for Summary Judgment (Summary Judgment Order) dated November 1, 2012. The District Court's Summary Judgment Order granted the Motions for Summary Judgment of the FTA and the City with regard to the Plaintiffs' claims under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The District Court granted the Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment with regard to three claims under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act [Section 4(f)]. The Summary Judgment Order concluded that the FTA and the City were required to conduct additional analyses (1) regarding whether the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative was a feasible and prudent alternative under Section 4(f), (2) whether the Project would "constructively use" Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park under Section 4(f), and (3) the identification of traditional cultural properties (TCP) and, for any TCPs identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), complete a Section 4(f) analysis.

The scope of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) is limited to the evaluation and findings under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act related to whether the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative and causes the least overall harm per 23 CFR 774.3(c), and the Section 4(f) analysis of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park. In addition, the Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) references the evaluations of previously unidentified aboveground TCPs within the project corridor. FTA and HART conducted those evaluations pursuant to the Summary Judgment Order and Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. On June 6, 2012, FTA determined there was one previously unidentified TCP within the area of potential effects (APE) of Sections 1-3 of the Project that was eligible for the NRHP. FTA also determined that the Project would have no adverse effect on that TCP. SHPO concurred with FTA's determinations. On August 28, 2013, FTA determined there were no previously unidentified TCPs within the APE of Section 4 of the Project that were

eligible for the NRHP and, therefore, the Project would have no adverse effect on those types of TCPs. SHPO concurred with those determinations. FTA and HART conducted a Section 4(f) analysis of any previously unidentified, NRHP-eligible TCPs within the APE of the Project, and determined that the Project would not result in a Section 4(f) use of those types of TCPs.

The Section 4(f) regulations (23 CFR 774.17) indicate that, with certain identified exceptions, a “use” of Section 4(f) property occurs: (1) When land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility; (2) When there is a temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the statute’s preservation purpose as determined by the criteria in Section 774.13(d); or (3) When there is a constructive use of a Section 4(f) property as determined by the criteria in Section 774.15. A feasible and prudent avoidance alternative avoids using Section 4(f) property and does not cause other severe problems of a magnitude that substantially outweighs the importance of protecting the Section 4(f) property. If there are no feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives to the use of Section 4(f) properties, FTA may only approve the alternative that causes the least overall harm in light of the statute’s preservation purpose [23 CFR 774.3(c)].

### **Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative**

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, as defined in the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project Alternatives Analysis (DTS 2006), would connect to the Dillingham Boulevard Alignment ‘Ewa (toward the ‘Ewa plain, generally west) of Ka‘aahi Street, where it would transition from an aerial alignment to a 5,980-foot tunnel. To transition from an aerial structure to a tunnel, the aerial guideway would descend to ground level, then into a trench, and finally into a tunnel portal. The tunnel would cross under the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building property, A‘ala Park, and Nu‘uanu Stream, then follow under Beretania Street past Punchbowl Street, where it would transition back to an aerial structure from the portal through a trench section along the mauka edge of the municipal parking structure and preschool to an aerial structure over the corner of the municipal parking structure.

As an aerial structure, the alignment would cross Alapai Street and transition to King Street through the recently constructed Alapai Transit Center then follow King Street to University Avenue and turn mauka crossing over H-1 to the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UH Mānoa) lower campus.

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is not a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative because it results in a use of Section 4(f) properties. It is feasible to construct the alternative as a matter of engineering, but it is not a prudent alternative because of its extraordinary cost, and other factors such as environmental impacts and long-term construction impacts. It is adjacent to seven parks, three NRHP-listed properties, three properties determined NRHP-eligible, and an additional 42 historic resources that are in-period and treated as eligible for listing on the NRHP. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would use one historic property already listed on the NRHP and three NRHP-eligible



properties. These are the OR&L parcel (including the OR&L Terminal Building and Office/Document Storage Building and the former filling station that were determined NRHP-eligible during completion of the Section 106 process for the Project), the NRHP-listed McKinley High School, and the King Florist Building, which is treated as NRHP-eligible.

The impacts on parks and historic properties; settlement risks from tunnel construction; environmental effects including visual impacts, impacts on historic architecture, and traffic and business access disruption during construction; and delayed benefits from this alternative would contribute to the imprudence of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. The overall extraordinary increase in the cost of the alternative alone makes the alternative imprudent.

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative was analyzed in light of the District Court's requirement to "fully consider the prudence and feasibility of the Beretania tunnel alternative specifically, and supplement the FEIS and ROD to reflect this reasoned analysis in light of evidence regarding costs, consistency with the Project's purpose, and other pertinent factors." Per 23 CFR 774.3(c), if there is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative, then FTA may approve, from among the remaining alternatives that use Section 4(f) property, only the alternative that causes the least overall harm in light of the statute's preservation purpose. This least overall harm analysis is required when multiple alternatives use Section 4(f) property. The analysis compares the ability to mitigate impacts; relative severity of the remaining harm after implementation of mitigation; relative significance of each Section 4(f) property; views of the officials with jurisdiction over a Section 4(f) property; degree to which purpose and need are met; magnitude of impacts on non-Section 4(f) resources; and cost. After consideration of these factors, the FTA has determined that the Project would have the least overall harm compared to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

### **Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground**

Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground is a 3.4-acre urban park bounded by Coral, Halekauwila, Cooke, and Pohukaina Streets. Halekauwila Street was constructed through the mauka (toward the mountains) portion of the historic playground in the early 1990s and an elderly housing project has been constructed on this former playground property. The park and playground is protected under Section 4(f) as both a public park and as a historic site. The Project will be constructed outside the boundaries of the park, along Halekauwila Street (the mauka side of the park). Project pillars and the aerial guideway will be visible from within the park, especially on the mauka side, where a playground and several benches are located.

This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) evaluates whether the Project's impacts will result in constructive use of the park's activities, features, and attributes that qualify the park for Section 4(f) protection. A constructive use would occur if the Project's proximity impacts are so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f) are substan-

tially impaired. In general terms, this means that the value of the resource, in terms of its Section 4(f) purpose and significance, will be meaningfully reduced or lost.

The protected activities, features, and attributes that qualify Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park for protection include both its recreational use and its historic significance. Recreational uses include walking and jogging, use for organized sporting events, playing basketball, play-structure use, and bicycling. The Project will not substantially impair any of these recreational uses.

The protected activities, features, and attributes that qualify Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park for protection as a historic site are its historical development and use as a playground and its remaining architectural and landscape design features, including an Art Moderne comfort station and some remaining Art Deco design elements and layout. Construction of a new guideway within the immediate viewshed of the historic property resulted in an adverse effect finding under Section 106 for the diminishment of the setting. However, this visual intrusion does not reach the threshold of substantial impairment of the attributes which cause the playground to be eligible for the NRHP as it would still retain its historic attributes and features. The Playground's association with the national playground movement, for which the park is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A, will be unaffected by the Project's proximity to the mauka playground boundary. The Project would not affect the Art Deco/Art Moderne-style comfort station, the remaining portion of the 'Ewa boundary wall, internal walls and benches, and the general layout of the makai portion of the playground. The Project would not affect the features, attributes or design for which the property is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. As a result, there will be no constructive use of the historic activities, features, and attributes of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground.

While the Project will have significant effects on views of and over the park from the apartment building across the street, this view is not a contributing element to the significant activities, features, or attributes of the park that qualifies it for protection under Section 4(f). The Project will not use Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground under Section 4(f).

Under 23 CFR 774.3, an evaluation of feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives is required if the alternative results in a use of any Section 4(f) resource. Since the Project does not result in a use (constructive or otherwise) of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground, the regulations do not require analysis of avoidance alternatives. Nevertheless, the Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) evaluates alternatives to an alignment near Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground.

## **Public Review and Comment**

FTA and HART issued the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) for public review and comment on May 31, 2013, and a notice of availability appeared in the *Federal Register* on June 7, 2013. HART held a public and agency Supplemental EIS/4(f) hearing on July 9, 2013. The comment period ended on July 22, 2013. Section 5 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) includes a summary of comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) and a summary of revisions made in this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) to address the comments. Responses also are provided to comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). Appendix A to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) contains copies of all submissions received along with responses to all substantive comments within the scope of the Supplemental EIS/4(f).

## **Record of Decision**

The FTA has issued an Amended ROD, which is included in Appendix F to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) pursuant to Pub. L. 112-141, 126 Stat. 405, Section 1319(b). The ROD has been supplemented with a section pertaining to this Supplemental EIS/4(f). The findings made in the January 2011 ROD, however, are unaltered, except where the Amended ROD expressly alters them.





## **1.1 Purpose and Scope of this Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Section 4(f) Evaluation**

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and City and County of Honolulu (City) prepared and distributed a Final Environmental Impact Statement /Section 4(f) Evaluation [EIS/4(f)] for the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project (now called the Honolulu Rail Transit Project) in June 2010. The alternative evaluated is referred to as the Project. The Final EIS/4(f) identified environmental impacts and mitigations for the Project, including the use of properties protected under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act. In January 2011, the FTA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for the Project, selecting a 20-mile alternative that extends from Kapolei to Ala Moana Center, via Honolulu's waterfront. The Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART) is the agency within the City with jurisdiction to oversee the planning, construction, operation, and extension of the rail system. The FTA is the lead Federal agency and HART is the project sponsor.

This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) has been prepared to address the Judgment and Partial Injunction (Judgment) of the United States District Court for the District of Hawai'i (District Court) in *HonoluluTraffic.com, et al., vs. Federal Transit Administration, et al.*, Civ. No. 11-00307 AWT (Appendix B). The Judgment, filed December 27, 2012 requires the FTA and the City to comply with the District Court's Summary Judgment Order dated November 1, 2012 (Appendix C). The District Court's Order on Cross-motions for Summary Judgment (Summary Judgment Order) granted the Motions for Summary Judgment of the FTA and the City with regard to the Plaintiffs' claims under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as well as under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act [Section 4(f)], with the exception of three claims. The Summary Judgment Order concluded that the FTA and the City were required to conduct additional analyses (1) regarding whether the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative was a feasible and prudent alternative under Section 4(f), (2) whether the Project would "constructively use" Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park under Section 4(f), and (3) the identification of traditional cultural properties (TCP) and, for any TCPs identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), complete a Section 4(f) Analysis.

The Summary Judgment Order required the FTA and the City to prepare a Supplemental EIS/4(f) with regard to the analysis of whether the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative was feasible and prudent (Summary Judgment Order, page 27). The Summary Judgment Order stated that the Final EIS/4(f) "must also be supplemented to the extent that [the analysis of the constructive use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park] affects its analysis or conclusions" (Summary Judgment Order, page 21).

This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) includes the analysis of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative required by the Judgment. It also includes the required additional analysis of whether the Project will have a constructive use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park under Section 4(f).

In addition to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f), the FTA and the City have completed an identification of previously unidentified above-ground TCPs within the project corridor (HART 2012a, HART 2012b, HART 2012c, HART 2013c, HART 2013d). The TCP studies are incorporated by reference into this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). The TCP studies were available for public review and meetings were held with the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD), consulting parties, and Native Hawaiian organizations as specified in Stipulation II.A of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) among the FTA, City, U.S. Navy, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. For Sections 1-3 of the Project, FTA identified one previously unidentified TCP within the area of potential effects (APE) that was eligible for the NRHP (Huewaipi), but determined that the Project would have no adverse effect on that TCP (FTA 2012). The SHPO concurred with those determinations (SHPD 2012, 2012a). For Section 4 of the Project, FTA found that there were no previously unidentified TCPs within the APE that were eligible for the NRHP and, as a result, determined that the Project would have no adverse effect on those types of TCPs (FTA 2013). The SHPO concurred with those determinations (SHPD 2013). FTA and HART also conducted a Section 4(f) evaluation of any previously unidentified, NRHP-eligible TCPs within the Project APE (See Appendix E). Based on that evaluation, FTA determined that the Project would not result in any Section 4(f) use of any previously unidentified, NRHP-eligible TCPs within the APE.

This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) does not alter or withdraw any approvals or decisions made under other regulations or authorities, including, but not limited to, the Hawai'i Environmental Policy Act (Hawai'i Revised Statutes Chapter 343), Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, Sections 401, 402, and 404 of the Clean Water Act, or Sections 9 and 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.

## 1.2 Section 4(f) Background

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 USC 303), in pertinent paragraphs, provides: (c) Approval of programs and projects. Subject to subsection (d), the Secretary may approve a transportation program or project (other than any project for a park road or parkway under Section 204 of title 23) requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wild-life and waterfowl refuge of national, State, or local significance, or land of an historic site of national, State, or local significance (as determined by the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, area, refuge, or site) only if:

(1) there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and

(2) the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.

FTA has developed and promulgated joint regulations with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) implementing and interpreting Section 4(f) (23 CFR 774). In addition to the Section 4(f) regulations, FTA has adopted FHWA's Section 4(f) Policy Paper (USDOT 2012) to guide Section 4(f) analyses. The analysis in this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) has been conducted in accordance with 23 CFR 774 and the Section 4(f) Policy Paper.

### **1.2.1 Section 4(f) Uses**

The Section 4(f) regulations (23 CFR 774.17) indicate that, with certain identified exceptions, a "use" of Section 4(f) property occurs:

(1) When land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility;

(2) When there is a temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the statute's preservation purpose as determined by the criteria in Section 774.13(d); or

(3) When there is a constructive use of a Section 4(f) property as determined by the criteria in Section 774.15.

#### **Constructive Use**

A constructive use occurs when the transportation project does not incorporate land from a Section 4(f) property, but the project's proximity impacts are so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Substantial impairment occurs only when the protected activities, features, or attributes of the property are substantially diminished [23 CFR 774.15(a)].

The FTA has determined that a constructive use occurs when:

- The projected noise level increase attributable to the project substantially interferes with the use and enjoyment of a noise-sensitive facility of a property protected by Section 4(f), such as
  - Hearing the performances at an outdoor amphitheater
  - Sleeping in the sleeping area of a campground
  - Enjoyment of a historic site where a quiet setting is a generally recognized feature or attribute of the site's significance

- Enjoyment of an urban park where serenity and quiet are significant attributes
- Viewing wildlife in an area of a wildlife and waterfowl refuge intended for such viewing
- The proximity of the proposed project substantially impairs esthetic features or attributes of a property protected by Section 4(f), where such features or attributes are considered important contributing elements to the value of the property. Examples of substantial impairment to visual or esthetic qualities would be the location of a proposed transportation facility in such proximity that it obstructs or eliminates the primary views of an architecturally significant historic building, or substantially detracts from the setting of a Section 4(f) property which derives its value in substantial part due to its setting;
- The project results in a restriction of access which substantially diminishes the utility of a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, or a historic site;
- The vibration impact from construction or operation of the project substantially impairs the use of a Section 4(f) property; or
- The ecological intrusion of the project substantially diminishes the value of wildlife habitat in a wildlife and waterfowl refuge adjacent to the project.

The FTA has determined that a constructive use does not occur when:

- Compliance with the requirements of 36 CFR 800.5 for proximity impacts of the proposed action, on a site listed on or eligible for the National Register, results in an agreement of “no historic properties affected” or “no adverse effect”;
- The impact of projected traffic noise levels of the proposed highway project on a noise-sensitive activity do not exceed the FHWA noise abatement criteria as contained in Table 1 in part 23 CFR 772, or the projected operational noise levels of the proposed transit project do not exceed the noise impact criteria for a Section 4(f) activity in the FTA guidelines for transit noise and vibration impact assessment;
- The projected noise levels exceed the relevant threshold in paragraph (f)(2) of [23 CFR 774.15] because of high existing noise, but the increase in the projected noise levels if the proposed project is constructed, when compared with the projected noise levels if the project is not built, is barely perceptible (3 dBA or less);
- There are proximity impacts to a Section 4(f) property, but a governmental agency’s right-of-way acquisition or adoption of project location, or the Administration’s approval of a final environmental document, established the location for the proposed transportation project before the designation, establishment, or change in the significance of the property. However, if it is reasonably foreseeable that a property would qualify as eligible for the

National Register prior to the start of construction, then the property should be treated as a historic site for the purposes of this section; or

- Overall (combined) proximity impacts caused by a proposed project do not substantially impair the activities, features, or attributes that qualify a property for protection under Section 4(f);
- Proximity impacts will be mitigated to a condition equivalent to, or better than, that which would occur if the project were not built, as determined after consultation with the official(s) with jurisdiction;
- Change in accessibility will not substantially diminish the utilization of the Section 4(f) property; or
- Vibration levels from project construction activities are mitigated, through advance planning and monitoring of the activities, to levels that do not cause a substantial impairment of protected activities, features, or attributes of the Section 4(f) property.

The Section 4(f) Policy Paper (USDOT 2012) provides additional guidance on constructive use. As defined in regulation, constructive use occurs when the proximity impacts of a project on an adjacent or nearby Section 4(f) property, after incorporation of mitigation, are so severe that the activities, features, or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Substantial impairment occurs when the protected activities, features, or attributes of the Section 4(f) property are substantially diminished. As a general matter, this means that the value of the resource, in terms of its Section 4(f) purpose and significance, will be meaningfully reduced or lost. The degree of impact and impairment must be determined in consultation with the officials with jurisdiction in accordance with 23 CFR 774.15(d)(3). In those situations where a potential constructive use can be reduced below a substantial impairment by the inclusion of mitigation measures, there will be no constructive use and Section 4(f) will not apply. If there is no substantial impairment, notwithstanding an adverse effect determination (under Section 106), there is no constructive use and Section 4(f) does not apply.

### **1.2.2 Prudent and Feasible Avoidance Alternatives**

If an alternative would use a Section 4(f) resource and the use is not *de minimis*, FTA can approve that alternative only by determining that (1) there is no prudent and feasible avoidance alternative, and (2) the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm resulting from the use. A *de minimis* impact is one that, after taking into account any measures to minimize harm (such as avoidance, minimization, mitigation or enhancement measures), results in either:

- A Section 106 finding of no adverse effect on a historic property or no historic properties affected; or

- A determination that the project would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes qualifying a park, recreation area, or refuge for protection under Section 4(f).

When the use is not *de minimis*, the first step in meeting the requirements for approval is to develop and consider avoidance alternatives.

An avoidance alternative is one that completely avoids the use of Section 4(f) resources. Per the Section 4(f) Policy Paper (USDOT 2012), “[A] project alternative that avoids one Section 4(f) property by using another Section 4(f) property is not an avoidance alternative.” An avoidance alternative must first be evaluated to determine whether it is prudent and feasible. FTA Section 4(f) regulations list a series of factors to consider in determining whether an alternative is prudent and feasible. A feasible and prudent avoidance alternative is defined in 23 CFR 774.17 as:

- (1) A feasible and prudent avoidance alternative avoids using Section 4(f) property and does not cause other severe problems of a magnitude that substantially outweighs the importance of protecting the Section 4(f) property. In assessing the importance of protecting the Section 4(f) property, it is appropriate to consider the relative value of the resource to the preservation purpose of the statute.
- (2) An alternative is not feasible if it cannot be built as a matter of sound engineering judgment.
- (3) An alternative is not prudent if:
  - (i) It compromises the project to a degree that it is unreasonable to proceed with the project in light of its stated purpose and need;
  - (ii) It results in unacceptable safety or operational problems;
  - (iii) After reasonable mitigation, it still causes:
    - (A) Severe social, economic, or environmental impacts;
    - (B) Severe disruption to established communities;
    - (C) Severe disproportionate impacts to minority or low income populations; or
    - (D) Severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes;
  - (iv) It results in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of an extraordinary magnitude;
  - (v) It causes other unique problems or unusual factors; or
  - (vi) It involves multiple factors in paragraphs (3)(i) through (3)(v) of this definition, that while individually minor, cumu-

latively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude.

### **1.2.3 Least Overall Harm**

If there is no feasible and prudent Section 4(f) avoidance alternative, FTA may approve only the alternative that causes the least overall harm as defined in 23 CFR 774.3(c)(1) as the alternative that:

- (1) Causes the least overall harm in light of the statute's preservation purpose. The least overall harm is determined by balancing the following factors:
  - i) The ability to mitigate adverse impacts to each Section 4(f) property (including any measures that result in benefits to the property);
  - ii) The relative severity of the remaining harm, after mitigation, to the protected activities, attributes, or features that qualify each Section 4(f) property for protection;
  - iii) The relative significance of each Section 4(f) property;
  - iv) The views of the official(s) with jurisdiction over each Section 4(f) property;
  - v) The degree to which each alternative meets the purpose and need for the project;
  - vi) After reasonable mitigation, the magnitude of any adverse impacts to resources not protected by Section 4(f); and
  - vii) Substantial differences in costs among the alternatives.
- (2) The alternative selected must include all possible planning, as defined in 23 CFR 774.17, to minimize harm to Section 4(f) property.

A least overall harm analysis balances these factors to eliminate the alternative(s) that, on balance, present the greatest harm in light of the Section 4(f) statute's preservationist perspective. Many of the factors included in the least overall harm standard duplicate the factors in the prudence test.

For more information about Section 4(f) requirements, see the FHWA and FTA Section 4(f) regulations in 23 CFR 774 and the FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper (FHWA 2012).

## **1.3 Environmental Review Process**

FTA and HART issued the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) for public review and comment on May 31, 2013, and a notice of availability appeared in the *Federal Register* on June 7, 2013. On July 9, 2013, HART held a public and agency

hearing on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), and the comment period ended on July 22, 2013. Section 5 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) includes a summary of comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) and revisions made in the Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) to address the comments. Responses also are provided to comments received on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). Appendix A to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) contains copies of all submissions received along with responses to all substantive comments pertaining to the scope of the Supplemental EIS/4(f).

This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) is being issued as a combined Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) and Amended ROD pursuant to Public Law 112-141, 126 Statute 405, Section 1319(b). The Amended ROD is included as Appendix F to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). The ROD has been supplemented with a section pertaining to this Supplemental EIS/4(f). The findings made in the January 2011 ROD, however, are unaltered, except where the Amended ROD expressly alters them.

## **1.4 Purpose and Need**

The Purpose and Need for the Project is included in the Final EIS/4(f) and is repeated here for the convenience of the reader.

### ***1.4.1 Purpose of the Project***

The purpose of the Honolulu [Rail Transit] Project is to provide high-capacity rapid transit in the highly congested east-west transportation corridor between Kapolei and UH Mānoa, as specified in the *O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan 2030* (ORTP) (O'ahuMPO 2007). The project is intended to provide faster, more reliable public transportation service in the study corridor than can be achieved with buses operating in congested mixed-flow traffic, to provide reliable mobility in areas of the study corridor where people of limited income and an aging population live, and to serve rapidly developing areas of the study corridor. The project also will provide additional transit capacity, an alternative to private automobile travel, and improve transit links within the study corridor. Implementation of the project, in conjunction with other improvements included in the ORTP, will moderate anticipated traffic congestion in the study corridor. The project also supports the goals of the Honolulu General Plan and the ORTP by serving areas designated for urban growth.

### ***1.4.2 Need for Transit Improvements***

There are several needs for transit improvements in the study corridor. These needs are the basis for the following goals:

- Improve corridor mobility
- Improve corridor travel reliability



- Improve access to planned development to support City policy to develop a second urban center
- Improve transportation equity

### **Improve Corridor Mobility**

Motorists and transit users experience substantial traffic congestion and delay at most times of the day, both on weekdays and on weekends. Average weekday peak-period speeds on the H-1 Freeway are currently less than 20 mph in many places and will degrade even further by 2030. Transit vehicles are caught in the same congestion. In 2007, travelers on O'ahu's roadways experienced 74,000 vehicle hours of delay on a typical weekday, a measure of how much time is lost daily by travelers stuck in traffic. This measure of delay is projected to increase to 107,000 daily vehicle hours of delay by 2030, assuming implementation of all planned improvements listed in the ORTP (except for a fixed-guideway system). Without these improvements, the ORTP indicates that daily vehicle hours of delay would increase to 154,000 vehicle hours.

Currently, motorists traveling from West O'ahu to Downtown experience highly congested traffic during the a.m. peak period. By 2030, after including all the planned roadway improvements in the ORTP, the level of congestion and travel time are projected to increase further. Average bus speeds in the study corridor have been decreasing steadily as congestion has increased. TheBus travel times are projected to increase through 2030. Within the urban core, most major arterial streets will experience increasing peak-period congestion, including Ala Moana Boulevard, Dillingham Boulevard, Kalākaua Avenue, Kapi'olani Boulevard, King Street, and Nimitz Highway. Expansion of the roadway system between Kapolei and UH Mānoa is constrained by physical barriers and by dense urban neighborhoods that abut many existing roadways. Given current and increasing levels of congestion, an alternative method of travel is needed within the study corridor independent of current and projected highway congestion.

### **Improve Corridor Travel Reliability**

As roadways become more congested, they become more susceptible to substantial delays caused by such incidents as traffic accidents or heavy rain. Even a single driver unexpectedly braking can have a ripple effect that delays hundreds of cars. Because of the operating conditions in the study corridor, current travel times are not reliable for either transit or automobile trips. Because TheBus primarily operates in mixed traffic, transit users experience the same level of travel time uncertainty as automobile users. To arrive at their destination on time, travelers must allow extra time in their schedules to account for the uncertainty of travel time. During the a.m. peak period, more than one-third of bus service is more than five minutes late. This lack of predictability is inefficient and results in lost productivity or free time. A need exists to provide more reliable transit services.

## **Improve Access to Planned Development to Support City Policy to Develop a Second Urban Center**

Consistent with the Honolulu General Plan, the highest population growth rates for the island are projected in the 'Ewa Development Plan area (comprised of the 'Ewa, 'Ewa Beach, Kapolei, Kalaeloa, Honokai Hale, and Makakilo areas), which is expected to grow by approximately 150 percent between 2000 and 2030. This growth represents nearly 50 percent of the total growth projected for the entire island. The communities of Wai'anae, Wahiawā, North Shore, Windward O'ahu, Waimānalo, and East Honolulu will have much lower population growth of up to 23 percent, if infrastructure policies support the planned growth rates in the 'Ewa Development Plan area. Kapolei, which is developing as a "second city" to Downtown, is projected to grow by more than 350 percent, to 55,500 people, the 'Ewa district by more than 100 percent, and Makakilo by nearly 125 percent between 2000 and 2030.

Accessibility to the overall 'Ewa Development Plan area is currently severely impaired by the congested roadway network, which will only get worse in the future. This area is less likely to develop as planned unless it is accessible to Downtown and other parts of O'ahu; therefore, the 'Ewa Development Plan area needs improved accessibility to support its future planned growth.

## **Improve Transportation Equity**

Equity is about the fair distribution of resources so that no group carries an unfair burden of the negative environmental, social, or economic impacts or receives an unfair share of benefits. Many lower-income and minority workers who commute to work in the PUC Development Plan area live in the corridor outside of the urban core. Transit-dependent households concentrated in the Pearl City, Waipahu, and Makakilo areas [Figure 1-9 of the Final EIS/4(f)] rely on transit availability, such as TheBus, for access to jobs in the PUC Development Plan area. Delay caused by traffic congestion accounts for nearly one-third of the scheduled time for routes between 'Ewa and Waikīkī. Many lower-income workers also rely on transit because of its affordability. These transit-dependent and lower-income workers lack a transportation choice that avoids the delay and schedule uncertainty currently experienced by TheBus. In addition, Downtown median daily parking rates are the highest among U.S. cities, further limiting access to Downtown by lower-income workers. Improvements to transit availability and reliability would serve all transportation system users, including minority and moderate- and low-income populations.

## **2.1 Alternative Evaluation**

Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/4(f) documents how alternatives were developed, evaluated, and refined. The full range of alternatives considered is presented in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/4(f).

During the Alternatives Analysis and preliminary engineering process, many corridors and modal alternatives were considered to identify transportation solutions to meet the project's Purpose and Need. The purpose of the Alternative Analysis is to screen potential alternatives on a number of factors, including but not limited to cost, constructability, and environmental considerations. The Alternatives Analysis makes recommendations on alternatives to be carried forward for further analysis in the environmental process.

The avoidance of Section 4(f) properties was an important consideration in designing and screening the alternatives that were considered. As a result of this approach, the majority of public parks, recreational properties, and historic properties identified within the study corridor are avoided by the project's design and location. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative was considered and eliminated in the Alternatives Analysis because it would have performed poorly in meeting the identified goals and objectives, which included measures that considered the balance between benefits and costs and the ability to build, operate, and maintain the alternative with available funds.

Section 5.5 of the Final EIS/4(f) evaluated alternatives that avoided the use of individual Section 4(f) resources and measures to minimize harm. As summarized in Section 5.9 of the Final EIS/4(f), no prudent and feasible avoidance alternatives were identified that will completely avoid Section 4(f) properties and that all possible planning was incorporated into the project to minimize harm.

Based on an assessment of the transportation benefits, public comments, and environmental analysis, the Final EIS/4(f) documented that the Airport Alternative would result in the least overall harm to Section 4(f) resources. The Airport Alternative was selected as the Project with the issuance of the Record of Decision on January 18, 2011.

## **2.2 Description of the Project**

The Honolulu Rail Transit Project is an exclusive right-of-way rail project being developed by HART with funding from FTA. As defined in the ROD, the Project includes the construction and operation of a 20-mile, elevated fixed guideway transit system along the Airport Alignment, extending from East Kapolei to Ala Moana Center (Figure 1). The Project will begin in East Kapolei and follow Kualaka'i Parkway and other future roadways to Farrington Highway. The guideway will follow Farrington Highway Koko Head (toward Koko Head, generally east) and continue along Kamehameha Highway to the vicinity of Aloha Stadium.






The Project will continue along Kamehameha Highway past Aloha Stadium to Nimitz Highway and turn makai onto Aolele Street, Ualena Street, and Waiwai Loop through the Honolulu International Airport to reconnect to Nimitz Highway near Moanalua Stream. From there, the Project continues to the Middle Street Transit Center, Koko Head along Dillingham Boulevard to the vicinity of Ka'aahi Street and then turns makai to connect to Nimitz Highway in the vicinity of Iwilei Road.

The Project will follow Nimitz Highway Koko Head to Halekauwila Street and then proceed along Halekauwila Street past Ward Avenue, where it will transition to Queen Street and Kona Street. The guideway will run above Kona Street to Ala Moana Center.

The Project includes 21 stations as well as supporting facilities that include a maintenance and storage facility near Leeward Community College, transit centers, park-and-ride lots, a parking structure, and traction power substations. The project schedule is shown in Figure 2.



**Figure 2. Project Schedule**

## 2.3 Content of the Final EIS/4(f) being Supplemented

This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) supplements Chapter 5 of the Final EIS/4(f) in two areas. This Supplemental EIS/4(f) includes the analysis as required by the Summary Judgment Order. First, it reconsiders the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, previously dismissed during the Alternatives Analysis, to determine if it would be a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative. It also compares the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative with the Project in a least overall harm analysis [Section 3 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. Lastly, it reconsiders the no-use determination for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park, taking full account that the Project will have an adverse effect on the park under Section 106 and significant visual effects in the vicinity of the park according to the NEPA finding [Section 4 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)].



### **3                      *Evaluation of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative***

---


The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative (Figure 3) is being reconsidered to determine if it is a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative or is the alternative that has the least overall harm to Section 4(f) resources in comparison to the Project. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative that was previously considered and eliminated during the Alternatives Analysis would avoid direct use of the Chinatown Historic District, Dillingham Transportation Building, and HECO Downtown Plant/Leslie A. Hicks Building. This chapter includes the analysis required by the Summary Judgment Order. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative was evaluated for Section 4(f) use according to the regulations and guidance outlined in Section 1.2.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) using the same process and assumptions detailed for the Project in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS/4(f).

#### **3.1    Description of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative**

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, as defined in the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project Alternatives Analysis (DTS 2006), would connect to the Dillingham Boulevard Alignment 'Ewa (toward the 'Ewa plain, generally west) of Ka'aahi Street, where it would transition from an aerial alignment to a 5,980-foot tunnel. To transition from an aerial structure to a tunnel, the aerial guideway would descend to ground level, then into a trench, and finally into a tunnel portal. The tunnel would cross under the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building property, A'ala Park, and Nu'uuanu Stream then follow under Beretania Street past Punchbowl Street, where it would transition back to an aerial structure from the portal through a trench section along the mauka edge of the municipal parking structure and preschool to an aerial structure over the corner of the municipal parking structure.

As an aerial structure, the alignment would cross Alapai Street and transition to South King Street through the recently constructed Alapai Transit Center, then follow King Street to University Avenue and turn mauka crossing over H-1 to the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UH Mānoa) lower campus (Figure 3). The guideway would follow the makai edge of King Street and require right-of-way at each station because the station platforms would overhang the properties makai of each station. Because King Street is a one-way street, the guideway would have to be at the edge of the street to prevent unsafe weaving between columns. An elevated median would also stop weaving but would block access to the opposite side of the street.





**Figure 3. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative**



Tunnel stations would be constructed at Ka'aahi and Fort Streets and elevated stations would be constructed at Alapai, Pensacola, Kalākaua, McCully, and Hausten Streets, and at UH Mānoa Lower Campus (Figure 4 through Figure 12). These figures identify NRHP-listed properties, eligible properties, and properties assumed to be eligible for the NRHP in the vicinity of the stations as historic. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative continues to UH Mānoa to provide quality of service in the study corridor comparable to that of the Project.









The schedule for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is shown in Figure 13, which extends more than two years beyond that for the Project (Figure 2).

The alignment and station locations reflect all possible planning to avoid or minimize harm to Section 4(f) properties. As proposed in the Alternatives Analysis, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would have used several Section 4(f) properties. The alternative was refined in the following ways to minimize and avoid such use.


The Fort Street Station, which would be underground, was moved one block 'Ewa to a parking lot, which would avoid the use of the following Section 4(f) properties, which surround the original station location (Figure 14):

- Central Fire Station
- Model/Progress Block
- Cathedral of Our Lady of Peace
- Kamali'i Mini Park


Construction impacts, station entrances and ventilation shafts would have used one or more of these properties. With this shift, there would be no Section 4(f) use in the vicinity of the Fort Street Station.

SYMBOLS			
	Fixed Guideway		Platform
	Roadway		Existing Building
	Property Required		Pedestrian Connection
	Station Entrance		Crosswalk


**Figure 4. Key to Figure 5 through Figure 12**




**Figure 5. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Ka'aahi Street Station**




**Figure 6. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Fort Street Station**




**Figure 7. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Alapai Street Station**




**Figure 8. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Pensacola Street Station**




**Figure 9. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Kalākaua Avenue Station**



**Figure 10. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative McCully Street Station**




**Figure 11. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative Hausten Street Station**



**Figure 12. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative UH Mānoa Station**





**Figure 13. Project Schedule for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative**

Similarly, the Kalākaua Station location proposed in the Alternatives Analysis was between Kalākaua Avenue and Punahou Street with two entrances. The mauka station entrance would have used the Heu Commercial Building (Figure 15). To avoid Section 4(f) properties on the mauka side, the mauka station entrance was relocated adjacent to the King Kalākaua Building, which is also a historic property. This avoids all direct use of Section 4(f) properties by the station, but would require the full acquisition of 1340 King Street, currently occupied by Paradise Cruise LTD. This would increase business displacements, acquisitions, and right-of-way costs compared to the use of the Heu Commercial Building. Shifting the entire station Koko Head or ‘Ewa would not be an avoidance alternative, as the makai entrance would use either the Washington Middle School or the Continental Building, both of which are NRHP eligible.

Finally, at the Husten Street Station location proposed in the Alternatives Analysis, the mauka station entrance would create a use of Mō‘ili‘ili Triangle Park (Figure 16). The mauka entrance was shifted ‘Ewa, out of the park. This avoidance alternative would require additional right-of-way acquisition from a parking lot ‘Ewa of the park.

Despite the above-described effort to avoid and minimize Section 4(f) impacts, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would result in Section 4(f) uses at other station locations. Avoidance alternatives for each of these are discussed in Section 3.3.






**Figure 14. Avoidance Alternative Development at the Fort Street Station**





**Figure 15. Avoidance Alternative Development at the Kalākau Avenue Station**





**Figure 16. Avoidance Alternative Development at the Hausten Street Station**

## 3.2 Section 4(f) Properties

Section 4(f) properties that would be affected by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative were identified using the same process and assumptions detailed for the Project in Section 5.4 of the Final EIS/4(f).

Seven public parks would be adjacent to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative (Table 1). The locations of the parks are shown on Figure 17. The City and County of Honolulu parks are open to the public from 5:00 a.m. to 10 p.m., except for A'ala Park, which is open from 6:00 a.m. to 9 p.m.

In addition to the park resources listed in Table 1, there are several properties that qualify for Section 4(f) protection because they are historic sites. During the Alternatives Analysis process, the City used qualified architectural historians to identify historic properties that may qualify for NRHP listing based on literature review, records searches, age (built before 1967) and a preliminary review of integrity to evaluate alternatives, consistent with Appendix A to 23 CFR 450, *Linking the Transportation Planning and NEPA Processes*. The identification of historic properties for this Section 4(f) analysis was drawn from sites listed on the NRHP, information from the Alternatives Analysis, and information on the Section 106 analysis, including NRHP-eligibility criteria, included in Section 4.16.1 of the Final EIS/4(f). The sites that were evaluated as potentially eligible for the NRHP for this analysis were identified by qualified architectural historians based on age and review of integrity during the Alternatives Analysis for purposes of screening analysis (DTS 2006) and using the same process and assumptions detailed for the Project in the Final EIS/4(f). The same approach to historic property boundaries as used in the evaluation of the Project documented in Section 4.16.3 of the Final EIS/4(f) was applied to the properties along the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

Historic sites that the City and FTA are treating as Section 4(f) properties along the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative include three NRHP-listed, three NRHP-eligible, and 42 additional historic resources that are in-period and treated as eligible for listing in the NRHP (Table 2). The locations of the historic properties are shown on Figure 17. The analysis of historic properties is detailed in Section 3.5.3 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). There are no known archaeological resources eligible for listing in the NRHP that would be used by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative [see Section 3.5.3 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)].






Figure 17. Historic and Recreational Properties Affected by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative





**Table 1. Publicly Owned Park and Recreational Properties Adjacent to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative**

Property*	Description	Section 4(f) use
A'ala Park	A'ala Park is a 291,000-square-foot community park owned and maintained by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation. It is open green space with basketball courts, a skatepark, and picnicking, walking, and jogging uses.	Guideway in tunnel below park, no use
Kamali'i Mini Park	Kamali'i Mini Park is a 30,000-square-foot park owned and maintained by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation. The park contains planters, sidewalks, and urban landscaping. There are no active recreational facilities.	Guideway in tunnel adjacent to park, no use
Thomas Square	Thomas Square is a park and NRHP-listed historic property. It is a 256,000-square-foot open space owned and maintained by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation. It is commonly used for walking, jogging, and passive recreation. There are no active recreational facilities, such as tennis or basketball courts. Views of and from the park are identified as significant in Chapter 21 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu.	Elevated guideway adjacent to park, no use
Pāwa'a Inha Park	Pāwa'a Inha Park is a 55,600-square-foot community park owned and maintained by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation. It is open green space with park benches and footpaths but no active recreational facilities, such as tennis or basketball courts.	Elevated guideway adjacent to park, no use
Old Stadium Park	Old Stadium Park is a 265,000-square-foot park owned and maintained by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation. It is commonly used for picnicking, walking, jogging, and passive recreation. There are no active recreational facilities, such as tennis or basketball courts.	Elevated guideway adjacent to park, no use
Mō'ili'ili Neighborhood Park	Mō'ili'ili Neighborhood Park is a 140,000-square-foot park owned and maintained by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation. It includes a baseball diamond and a softball diamond along the 'Ewa side, with open space to the Koko Head side.	Elevated guideway adjacent to park, no use
Mō'ili'ili Triangle Park	Mō'ili'ili Triangle Park is a 16,600-square-foot park owned and maintained by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation. It located in the triangle of land between Beretania and King Streets. It contains park benches and holds the Mō'ili'ili torii (Shinto-style gateway gifted by Honolulu's sister city of Hiroshima, Japan).	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to park, no use

\*The locations of Section 4(f) properties are shown on Figure 17.

**Table 2. National Register of Historic Places Eligible or Listed Properties Evaluated for Section 4(f) Use**

Property	Description	Impact or relationship to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative	Section 4(f) use
OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building within OR&L Parcel (NRHP Eligible, Criteria A and C)	The OR&L Office/Document Storage Building is a two-story, Colonial Revival-style building at 355 North King Street constructed in 1914. The OR&L Terminal Building is a two-story, Spanish Mission Revival-style building constructed in 1925	Ka'aahi Street Station construction would require temporary support, relocation, or removal of the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and temporary loss of existing street access and parking for the OR&L Terminal Building. Permanent entrances for underground Ka'aahi Street Station located within boundary of historic property	Direct use
Former filling station within OR&L Parcel (NRHP Eligible, Criterion A)	Building at 355 North King Street is a single-story, flat-roofed, masonry building constructed in 1940	Ka'aahi Street Station construction would require temporary support, relocation, or removal of the former filling station. Permanent entrances for underground Ka'aahi Street Station located within boundary of historic property	Direct use
Basalt paving blocks within OR&L Parcel (NRHP Eligible, Criteria A, C, and D)	Roughly shaped, rectangular basalt paving blocks installed along Iwilei Road circa 1914	No use of paving blocks	No use
Chinatown Historic District (NRHP Listed, Criteria A and C)	The Chinatown Historic District encompasses approximately 36 acres near Nu'uuanu Stream and Honolulu Harbor, just 'Ewa of Downtown Honolulu. The area derives its historical significance from its central role in the life of the local Chinese community, including its commerce, architecture, and institutions	Guideway in tunnel below district, construction impacts within roadway right-of-way inside district boundary	No use
Bethel and Chaplain Lane Building*	Building at 1171 Bethel Street built in 1951	Entrances for underground station located across Bethel Street from building	No use
Schnak Building*	Building at 1183 Bethel Street built in 1929	Entrances for underground station located across Bethel Street from building	No use
Hawai'i Capital Historic District (NRHP Listed, Criteria A, B, and C)	The Hawai'i Capital Historic District includes historic properties dating between 1794 and 1969. The area derives its historical significance from its central role in the governance of Hawai'i	Guideway in tunnel below district, construction impacts adjacent to district	No use
Board of Water Supply Engineering Building*	Building at 630 S Beretania Street built in 1939	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Board of Water Supply Administration Building*	Building at 630 S Beretania Street built in 1957	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Thomas Square (NRHP Listed, Criterion A)	NRHP-listed park where Kamehameha III was restored to the throne in 1843. Established as a city park in 1925	Elevated guideway adjacent to park	No use

**Table 2. National Register of Historic Places Eligible or Listed Properties  
Evaluated for Section 4(f) Use (continued)**

Property	Description	Impact or relationship to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative	Section 4(f) use
McKinley High School (NRHP Listed, Criteria A and C)	NRHP-listed property at 1039 South King Street. The historic campus includes six contributing buildings built between 1923 and 1939	Entrances for aerial Pensacola Street Station located within boundary of historic property	Direct use
First Chinese Church of Christ*	Building at 1050 S King Street built in 1930	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
1-story Deco Building, 1026 S King St*	Building at 1026 S King Street built in 1951	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Nitta Commercial Building*	Building at 1103 S King Street built in 1951	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Fukumoto Commercial Building*	Building at 1111 S King Street built in 1947	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Ishikawa 1-story Commercial Building*	Building at 1117 S King Street built in 1940	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Chang Commercial Building*	Building at 1125 S King Street built in 1948	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Chow 1-story Commercial Building*	Building at 1133 S King Street built in 1950	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Masui 1-story Commercial Building*	Building at 1145 S King Street built in 1940	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Saiki 1-1/2 Story Commercial Building*	Building at 1149 S King Street built in 1941	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Wong Commercial Building*	Building at 1155 S King Street built in 1947	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Precision Radio*	Building at 1160 S King Street built in 1950	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Clyde's Cleaners*	Building at 1234 S King Street built in 1949	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Mediterraneo*	Building at 1275 S King Street built in 1949	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Dr. A Tsuda Office*	Building at 1290 S King Street built in 1917	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Trophy House*	Building at 1301 S King Street built in 1957	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
American Stereo*	Building at 1327 S King Street built in 1964	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Ikuta Commercial Building*	Building at 1401 S King Street built in 1955	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Sushi Sasabune*	Building at 1423 S King Street built in 1960	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Territorial Board of Agriculture and Forestry Building*	Building at 1428 S King Street built in 1961	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
King Center Bank of Hawai'i*	Building at 1451 S King Street built in 1960	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Professional Center*	Building at 1479 S King Street built in 1955	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Continental Building*	Building at 1515 S King Street built in 1955	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to property	No use

**Table 2. National Register of Historic Places Eligible or Listed Properties Evaluated for Section 4(f) Use (continued)**

Property	Description	Impact or relationship to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative	Section 4(f) use
King Kalākaua Building*	Building at 1534 S King Street built in 1946	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to property	No use
Heu Commercial Building*	Building at 1562 S King Street built in 1940	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to property	No use
Washington Middle School*	Building at 1633 S King Street built between 1939 and 1953	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Dental Office, 1702 S King St*	Building at 1702 S King Street built in 1928	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
KNDI Radio*	Building at 1734B S King Street built in 1928	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Miss Hawai'i Building*	Building at 1738 S King Street built in 1930	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Kimura Florist*	Building at 1809 S King Street built in 1925	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
T. Ishibashi Building*	Building at 1869 S King Street built in 1962	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Tenrikyo Honolulu Church*	Building at 1902 S King Street built in 1946	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
King Florist* (Criterion C)	Building at 1915B S King Street built in 1945	Station Entrance and support buildings would displace the property.	Direct use
James M. Chrones Building*	Building at 2017 S King Street built in 1948	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Ishizuchi Shrine*	Building at 2020 S King Street built in 1962	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to property	No use
Safety Loan Building*	Building at 2065 S King Street built in 1964	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
J.C. Tom Building*	Building at 2239 S King Street built in 1929	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Choy Commercial Building*	Building at 2342 S King Street built in 1955	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
HK Restaurant*	Building at 2425 S King Street built in 1963	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use
Church of the Crossroads (NRHP Listed, Criteria A and C)	Building at 1212 University Avenue built in 1935	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	No use

\*Forty-two properties were evaluated by qualified architectural historians during the Alternatives Analysis based on age (built before 1967) and review of integrity and treated as eligible for the purpose of this analysis.



### 3.3 Use of Section 4(f) Properties by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative

To determine whether the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative, it was evaluated for Section 4(f) use according to the regulations and guidance outlined in Section 1.2.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) using the same process and assumptions detailed for the Project in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS/4(f).

To avoid and minimize the use of Section 4(f) resources, the Section 4(f) use analysis incorporates design changes to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative that was evaluated in the Alternatives Analysis [see Section 3.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. The changes are detailed in the evaluation of use of individual Section 4(f) properties.

Consistent with the findings of the Section 4(f) evaluation for the Project included in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS/4(f) and in Chapter 4 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f), there would be no direct or constructive use of the parks (Table 1) or historic properties (Table 2) adjacent to, but not directly affected by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. Thomas Square is a park and NRHP-listed historic property. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would not affect the park's design elements or recreational activities that contribute to the park's use and enjoyment. Views to and from Thomas Square are identified as significant views protected in Chapter 21 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu. The views to and from Thomas Square along South King Street are screened by trees and utility lines [shown in Figure 24 and discussed in Section 3.5.3 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. The Beretania Street Alternative would not substantially impair the attributes which cause Thomas Square to be eligible for the NRHP as it would still retain its historic attributes and features. The alternative will not result in a constructive use of Thomas Square. No use was found for parcels with similar properties in a context similar to the Project. This assessment was based on the similarity between the range of resources and proximity of the guideway evaluated in Section 5.6.3 of the Final EIS/4(f) and the range of park and historic resources affected by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

*De minimis* impacts were considered for properties with direct use. As detailed in Section 1.2.2, the incorporation of land from individual historic properties where an adverse effect determination has been made would not qualify as a *de minimis* impact. The consideration of *de minimis* impacts applies the same process and assumptions detailed for the Project in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS/4(f).

Except for the portal, station, and vent structures, the portion of the alternative traveling in a tunnel would not have a Section 4(f) use of the property above the tunnel, as per the Section 4(f) Policy Paper (USDOT 2012). The elevated guideway is generally located within the existing roadway right-of-way and would not require additional right-of-way. Right-of-way would be required for each of the

stations, and in many cases there are Section 4(f) properties in the vicinity of the stations (Figure 17). Because the Section 4(f) properties that would be used by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative are grouped around stations, the properties are evaluated by grouping around each station area.

### **3.3.1 O'ahu Rail and Land Parcel**

#### **Property Description**

The OR&L parcel includes four historic elements—the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building, OR&L Terminal Building, former filling station on the OR&L parcel, and basalt paving blocks along Iwilei Road. The OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building are two buildings on one property (OR&L parcel). They are considered contributing elements to the NRHP-eligible OR&L property.

- The **O'ahu Railway & Land Co. (OR&L) Terminal Building** is a two-story, Spanish Mission Revival-style building constructed in 1925. The property is important for its association with the OR&L, a force in the development of O'ahu, and as an example of a Spanish Mission Revival-style building with high artistic value. The property is listed on the Hawai'i state register along with the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C.
- The **OR&L Office/Document Storage Building** is a two-story, Colonial Revival-style building constructed in 1914. The property is important for its association with the OR&L, and as a rare surviving example of Colonial Revival architecture in Honolulu. The property is listed on the Hawai'i state register and eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and C.
- The **former filling station** on the OR&L parcel is a single-story, flat-roofed, masonry building constructed in 1940. The property is important for its association with the development of the A'ala neighborhood. Although it is located on the OR&L parcel, because of the period of significance it is not a contributing resource to that historic complex. The filling station has been identified as a separate historic property. The property is eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion A.
- The **OR&L basalt paving blocks** are roughly shaped, rectangular basalt paving blocks installed along Iwilei Road circa 1914. They are important for their association with the development of Honolulu's roadway infrastructure, and because they demonstrate the distinctive method of using basalt paving blocks in road construction in Honolulu. The paving blocks were not identified as a contributing resource to that historic complex but therefore have been identified as a separate historic property. The property is eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criteria A, C, and D.

## **Section 4(f) Evaluation**

The Ka'aahi Street Station is within the boundary of the NRHP-eligible OR&L parcel that includes two contributing elements, the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building. In addition the parcel includes two historic properties that are not identified as contributing to the OR&L property, but have been determined eligible individually: basalt paving blocks along Iwilei Road, and a former filling station (Figure 18). The State of Hawai'i Department of Accounting and General Services indicated in its July 10, 2013 letter on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) that the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would have negative impacts to its facilities at the OR&L parcel (Appendix A).

The Ka'aahi Street Station would be constructed using a cut-and-cover approach that opens a large pit the size of the station, which is closed and restored at the end of station construction. This would require temporary support, relocation, or removal of the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and the former filling station and would constitute use of the Section 4(f) property. The OR&L Terminal Building would not be directly affected during construction; however, access to the building would be restricted. The permanent station entrances, ventilation structures, and other above-ground features would be within the boundary of the OR&L parcel (Figure 5) and would result in a direct permanent use of the property. The Ka'aahi Street Station would result in use of the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building, OR&L Terminal Building, and former filling station; land within the boundary of these resources would be permanently incorporated into a transportation use. The basalt paving blocks would not be altered by the Ka'aahi Street Station.

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would tunnel under A'ala Park, which would not constitute a use of the park; however, the City and County of Honolulu Department of Design and Construction indicated in its June 14, 2013 comment via email on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) that a tunnel easement under A'ala Park would not be consistent with City policy. The City avoids, wherever possible, easements affecting City parks for purposes that are not directly related to park use in order to avoid future constraints on development or redevelopment of parks.

## **Avoidance Alternatives and Measures to Minimize Harm**

The Ka'aahi Street Station is located at the 'Ewa end of the tunnel where the tracks would be transitioning from above ground to tunnel. Stations must be placed on a flat and straight track section to meet Americans with Disabilities Act requirements for safe loading and unloading of the train; therefore, the station could not be moved 'Ewa. Moving the station Koko Head would place it in A'ala Park, another Section 4(f)-protected resource. The construction would still require substantial disturbance to the OR&L parcel to excavate for the station, resulting in use of both the OR&L parcel and A'ala Park. Nu'uuanu Stream and the Chinatown Historic District are immediately Koko Head of A'ala Park.



**Figure 18. Avoidance Alternatives Evaluated for the Ka'aahi Street Station**

## **Section 4(f) Use**

After incorporating all measures to minimize harm, the Ka'aahi Station would result in the use of three Section 4(f) properties: the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building, OR&L Terminal Building, and the former filling station on the OR&L parcel.

### **3.3.2 McKinley High School**

#### **Property Description**

The **McKinley High School** NRHP listing form states "The McKinley High School is significant in the history of education in the State of Hawai'i as the oldest high school in the State and the leading public school in Hawai'i during the nineteen twenties and thirties." The form identifies five buildings, demonstrates that the school is also "architecturally significant as one of the most elegant examples of Spanish Colonial revival architecture in Hawai'i." The property is NRHP-listed under Criteria A and C.

#### **Section 4(f) Evaluation**

The elevated guideway for the Beretania Tunnel Alternative would be adjacent to and visible from a number of vantage points within the McKinley High School Property. The NRHP-listed McKinley High School is on the makai/'Ewa corner of the Pensacola/King intersection. A series of eight historic buildings is on the makai/Koko Head corner, the Kaiser Permanente Honolulu Clinic and parking garage is on the 'Ewa/mauka corner and businesses and residences are on the mauka/Koko Head corner (Figure 19). The station layout includes a makai entrance within the McKinley High School property, and the use is limited to a grassy area adjacent to King Street. The elevated platforms would cross over the mauka edge of the McKinley High School property. The support structure of the platform and guideway, station entrance, and associated ground level station features would affect non-contributing elements of the McKinley High School property. The station construction would permanently incorporate land into a transportation use and introduce visual elements, which would diminish the integrity of the property's setting. Therefore, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would have a direct use of the historic property.


#### **Avoidance Alternatives and Measures to Minimize Harm**

One alternative would be to shift the station Koko Head. However this would impact a series of Section 4(f) buildings on the makai side of King Street, and create full acquisitions or demolition of either 3 or 4 of them. Since this alternative would use other Section 4(f) properties, it would not be an avoidance alternative. The 15,800 square-foot partial acquisition at McKinley High School would generate less harm than the demolition of multiple Section 4(f) properties.

## **Section 4(f) Use**

The Pensacola Street Station would result in the use of McKinley High School.





**Figure 19. Avoidance Alternatives Evaluated for McKinley High School**

### **3.3.3 King Florist**

#### **Property Description**

The **King Florist** Building, named for the former tenant at 1915B South King Street, was built in 1945 and was identified in the alternatives analysis as potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criteria C because of its type, period, and method of construction (DTS 2006).

#### **Section 4(f) Evaluation**

The McCully Street Station would require property along the makai side of South King Street to accommodate makai edge of the station platform, station entrance building, and traction power substation (TPSS). This would require acquisition and demolition of the King Florist Building, a NRHP-eligible property (Figure 20). The McCully Street Station would permanently incorporate the land into a transportation use.

#### **Avoidance Alternatives and Measures to Minimize Harm**

The station location proposed in the Alternatives Analysis was situated closer to Wiliwili Street, where the makai entrance and ancillary facilities would have demolished the NRHP-eligible Safety Loan Building. The mauka entrance would have been adjacent to the NRHP-eligible Ishizuchi Shrine (Figure 20). The James M. Chrones Building is another NRHP-eligible building that takes up most of the block between McCully Street and the Safety Loan Building. Shifting the station slightly 'Ewa of Wiliwili Street, but within the same block, would use the James M. Chrones Building.

Section 4(f) impacts were reduced by shifting the station one block to the 'Ewa side of McCully Street. The intersection of McCully and King Streets has historic properties on both makai corners. With the 'Ewa shift, the station would avoid the Safety Loan Building as well as the James M. Chrones Building; however, it would use the King Florist Building, which is a smaller and less prominent building than either the Safety Loan Building or James M. Chrones Building. Its acquisition would be less expensive as well. For these two reasons, it is a least harm alternative to using the Safety Loan or James M. Chrones buildings.

Another possible avoidance for impact to the King Florist Building would be to move the TPSS and other ancillary buildings mauka of King Street. However, the space requirements around the station entrance and station platforms would still require a right-of-way acquisition at the King Florist Building, resulting in a use of the property. Therefore, moving the ancillary buildings would not avoid the use, while creating an additional right-of-way acquisition mauka of the station.

#### **Section 4(f) Use**

The McCully Street Station would result in the direct use of the King Florist Building.





**Figure 20. Avoidance Alternatives Evaluated for King Florist**



### **3.3.4 Temporary Occupancy**

Construction of the Fort Street Station would include excavation within the roadway right-of-way inside the Chinatown Historic District boundary. Because it would be limited to within the right-of-way, it would not constitute a temporary occupancy. Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative construction would not cause temporary occupancy of any Section 4(f) properties beyond those already identified for direct use.

### **3.3.5 Summary of Use of Section 4(f) Properties by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative**

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would use one historic property already listed on the NRHP and three NRHP-eligible properties. These are the OR&L parcel (including the Office/Document Storage Building and OR&L Terminal Building and the former filling station that were determined NRHP-eligible during completion of the Section 106 process for the Project), the NRHP-listed McKinley High School, and the NRHP-eligible King Florist Building.

## **3.4 Evaluation of Feasibility**

23 CFR 774 defines a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative as an alternative that avoids using Section 4(f) property and does not cause other severe problems of a magnitude that substantially outweighs the importance of protecting Section 4(f) properties [see Section 1.2.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. An alternative is not feasible if it cannot be built as a matter of sound engineering judgment.

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would require tunnel construction through mixed ground conditions below the water table for most or all of its length (DTS 2007), which would increase the risk of settlement and damage to adjacent buildings, including those in the Chinatown and Hawai'i Capital Historic Districts, which are listed in the NRHP. Because of the ground conditions and shallow depth of the Beretania Street Tunnel (between 20 and 40 feet of cover), ground settlement is a particular risk. The depth of the tunnel would increase in the vicinity of the Hawai'i State Capitol to avoid conflicts with existing vehicle access to the Capitol parking garage. Pre-construction testing and pre-grouting of vulnerable ground would be required to reduce the potential for creating voids that lead to settlement.

Surface settlement can occur if the ground exposed by the tunnel excavation relaxes into the excavation before the tunnel lining can be installed to check the inward movement. Earth-pressure balance tunnel boring machines (TBM) reduce settlement to a minimum by supporting the ground beyond the machine's rotating cutterhead with pressurized fluids (Figure 21). As the TBM is advanced, fluid carrying the excavated soil is conducted via pressure doors through the machine to a muck-train for disposal. Segments of the tunnel lining are assembled into

rings behind the cutter-head and bolted to the previously assembled ring. As the machine is advanced, cement grout is pumped behind the lining to fill the circumferential void left by the steel skin of the advancing machine.

If silt, sands, or other fine soils above the tunnel under significant hydro-static pressure are encountered at the face, the pressurized soils can flow quickly into the excavated face, leaving a void high above the tunnel which is not reached by the regular cement back-grout. This void can then work its way to the surface as material caves in resulting in surface settlement. The risk is reduced by carefully and continually measuring the volume of material being extracted through the machine and comparing that volume with theoretical volume of the advancing excavation. If the monitored amount of excavated material exceeds the volume of the tunnel excavation, tunneling must be temporarily halted and the voids located by drilling from the surface or from the tunnel. Cement-grout or other fill material is pumped into the void before it can reach the surface and cause settlement and damage to structures or surface roadways near the tunnel.



Source: John Walser of Sound Transit

**Figure 21. Example of a Tunnel Boring Machine**

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would require surface excavation of portals, stations, and ventilation facilities in areas with congested traffic. As discussed later in Section 3.5.3, the construction period would include prolonged lane closures and disturbance of historic properties and require the treatment of contaminated soils and construction methods appropriate for the varied sub-surface conditions. These issues pose difficulty to construction, increase

construction costs, and introduce a potential for damage to historic properties, but it would be feasible as a matter of technical engineering to construct the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

### 3.5 Evaluation of Prudence

23 CFR 774 defines a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative as an alternative that avoids using Section 4(f) property and does not cause other severe problems of a magnitude that substantially outweighs the importance of protecting Section 4(f) properties [see Section 1.2.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. The evaluation of prudence is only applicable when considering a Section 4(f) avoidance alternative. An alternative is not prudent if:

- It compromises the project to a degree that it is unreasonable to proceed with the project in light of its stated purpose and need;
- It results in unacceptable safety or operational problems;
- After reasonable mitigation, it still causes:
  - Severe social, economic, or environmental impacts;
  - Severe disruption to established communities;
  - Severe disproportionate impacts to minority or low income populations; or
  - Severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes;
- It results in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of an extraordinary magnitude;
- It causes other unique problems or unusual factors; or
- It involves multiple factors in [the paragraphs above], that while individually minor, cumulatively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude.

#### 3.5.1 Effectiveness at Meeting Purpose and Need

The first test for prudence is whether or not an alternative would compromise the project to a degree that it is unreasonable to proceed with the project in light of its stated purpose and need [Section 1.4 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. This section evaluates how well the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative meets these needs considering the measures evaluated in Section 7.2 of the Final EIS/4(f).

#### **Improve corridor mobility**

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would serve the same corridor and generate similar transit ridership and benefits to the Project (Table 3). Both alternatives would terminate at major activity centers in the Koko Head end of the alignment. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would include additional stations and directly serve UH Mānoa, while requiring a bus transfer to Ala

Moana Center. The approved Project would directly serve Ala Moana Center and requires a bus transfer to UH Mānoa. These bus transfers are reflected in the transit travel times presented in Table 3. With the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, there would be a less than 1-percent increase in daily transit trips taken on O‘ahu, while the user benefits (travel time savings) for the average user would decrease by approximately 2 percent (Table 3).

**Table 3. Effectiveness in Improving Corridor Mobility**

Attribute	Alternative (2030)		
	Beretania Street Tunnel	The Project	The Project with Future Extension to UH Mānoa
<b>Transit Travel Time (minutes)*</b>			
Wai‘anae to UH Mānoa	84 minutes	93 minutes	86 minutes
Kapolei to Ala Moana Center	71 minutes	59 minutes	59 minutes
<b>Transit Performance</b>			
Daily rail boardings	120,700	116,300	132,700
Daily total transit trips	284,400	282,500	290,800
Transit user benefits (hours per year)	20,435,000	20,775,000	23,301,000
<b>Highway Performance</b>			
Daily islandwide vehicle miles traveled	13,065,000	13,049,000	13,019,000
Daily islandwide vehicle hours traveled	384,100	383,800	381,800
Daily islandwide vehicle hours of delay	85,700	85,800	84,500

\*Travel time includes transfer time

As shown in Table 3, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours traveled, and vehicle hours of delay would differ by less than 1 percent between the Project and the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

The Final EIS/4(f) analyzed the Project, including future extensions to Waikīkī and UH Mānoa. With the planned future extension to UH Mānoa only, rail boardings with the Project would increase to 132,700, which would be a 10 percent increase compared to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative (Table 3). Likewise, total islandwide transit trips would increase by two percent and user benefits by 14 percent compared to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

### **Improve corridor travel reliability**

Reliability for transit riders would be similar for the Project and the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, as similar percentage of passengers would be carried on fixed guideway transit and exclusive right-of-way (Table 4).



**Table 4. Effectiveness of Alternatives in Improving Corridor Travel Reliability**

Measure	Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative	The Project
Percent of transit trips carried on fixed guideway	42%	43%
Percent of transit passenger miles in exclusive right-of-way	44%	43%

### **Improve access to planned development to support City policy to develop a second urban center**

Both the Project and the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would support urban development consistent with the City General Plan (DPP 2002), which is the blueprint for future population and employment growth. With both alternatives, the majority of transit users in 'Ewa and Central O'ahu, which are areas planned for future development, would experience similar travel times (Table 3).

### **Improve transportation equity**

Equity relates to the fair distribution of a project's benefits and impacts, so that no group would carry an unfair burden of a project's negative environmental, social, or economic impacts or receive less than a fair share of a project's benefits.

Equity considers the population segments benefiting and net benefits by population segment. The benefit is calculated in travel-time savings and is compared between areas with concentrations of communities of concern and the remainder of O'ahu. Communities of concern are defined as concentrations of minority, low-income, transit-dependent, and linguistically isolated households. Approximately 35 percent of O'ahu's population currently live in areas that have concentrations of communities of concern. The spread of transit benefits would be similar between alternatives (Table 5). The calculation of travel-time savings is detailed in Section 3.4.2 of the Final EIS/4(f).

### **Summary of Purpose and Need Evaluation**

Based on the above analysis, both the Project and the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would have similar effectiveness at meeting the Purpose and Need. The Project would provide slightly greater user benefits by requiring a smaller percentage of transit passengers to transfer from rail to bus to reach their final destination. The Project would provide greater transit benefits to a higher percentage of the population within communities of concern. With the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, 22 percent of the population within communities of concern would experience a travel time increase compared to the No Build Alternative.

**Table 5. Equity Comparison of 2030 Transit Travel-time Savings Compared to the No Build Alternative**

Percent of Islandwide Population	That will experience	Percent of Population within Category	
		Within Communities of Concern	Outside Communities of Concern
The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative			
60%	Travel-time savings compared to the No Build Alternative	32%	68%
38%	Negligible travel-time change compared to the No Build Alternative	27%	73%
2%	Travel-time increase compared to the No Build Alternative	22%	78%
The Project			
61%	Travel-time savings compared to the No Build Alternative	34%	66%
39%	Negligible travel-time change compared to the No Build Alternative	36%	64%
0%	Travel-time increase compared to the No Build Alternative	0%	0%

### **3.5.2 Safety and Operational Considerations**

The second test for prudence is if the alternative would result in unacceptable safety or operational problems. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would include a tunnel section below the water table, which would increase operational and maintenance costs. Lighting, ventilation, and emergency egress systems would be required. The issues could be acceptably addressed through design and operating procedures. The elevated portion of the alignment would be similar to the Project guideway and stations; however, it would reduce capacity on King Street by one travel lane. King Street currently has excess capacity during peak hours; therefore, the reduction in capacity would adversely affect automobile travel but would not cause a failure in traffic operations. The alternative would be prudent regarding safety and operational concerns.

### **3.5.3 Social, Economic, Environmental, and Community Impacts**

The third test for prudence is if the alternative, after reasonable mitigation, would cause severe social, economic, or environmental impacts; disruption to established communities; disproportionate impacts to minority or low-income populations; or impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would have long-term social, economic, environmental, community, and environmental justice impacts that are similar to the Project. As with the Project [Section 4.10.3 of the Final EIS/4(f)], operational noise levels with the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative

could be mitigated to less than the FTA noise exposure impact criteria. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would substantially differ from the Project regarding visual, historic architecture, archaeological, and construction impacts.

## **Visual Impacts**

The visual assessment completed as part of the Alternatives Analysis (DTS 2007a) identified visual impacts ranging between medium and high in the South King Street corridor. King Street is a major arterial lined by a range of land uses, including parks, schools, historic buildings, and high-rise developments. Most of the corridor is low- to mid-rise commercial development dating from the middle part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Figure 22). The guideway would cross view corridors protected as either prominent or significant in Chapter 21 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu (Figure 23), including views from Alapai Street between King and Beretania Streets in the Hawai'i Capital Special District and views to and from Thomas Square in the Thomas Square/Honolulu Academy of Arts Special District (Figure 24). The views to and from Thomas Square along South King Street are screened by trees and utility lines.

The views in the Capital Special District are defined as prominent in the ordinance and the views in the Thomas Square/Honolulu Academy of Arts Special District are defined as significant; both sets of views are protected by the ordinance. As described in Section 4.8.3 of the Final EIS/4(f), where the guideway would be a dominant element within a protected view corridor, there would be a significant visual impact on that view corridor.

Compared to the Project, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would avoid view impacts in Chinatown and along the waterfront by traveling in a tunnel through the Chinatown and Hawai'i Capital Historic Districts. However, from the portal on Beretania Street and continuing along King Street, the elevated guideway would be in a heavily traveled mixed-use corridor with view-sensitive elements, including the Thomas Square/Honolulu Academy of Arts Special District. In contrast, once the Project turns from Nimitz Highway onto Halekauwila Street, the guideway travels through a mixed-use neighborhood with mostly industrial and commercial uses that are not visually sensitive along Halekauwila and Queen Streets. Overall, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would avoid view impacts in Chinatown and along the waterfront but would have view impacts along South King Street.





**Figure 22. Typical Views along the South King Street Corridor**





**Figure 23. Significant Views Identified in Chapter 21 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu**



**Figure 24. View of Guideway from Thomas Square Looking Makai**

## Parklands

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would travel as an elevated guideway adjacent to five City parks and in a tunnel adjacent to two additional parks (Table 6 and Figure 17). The effects on the parks adjacent to the elevated guideway would be similar to the effects of the Project on Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park [Section 4 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)] and Irwin Memorial Park [Section 5.6.1 of the Final EIS/4(f)] because the elevated guideway would be adjacent to the edge and visible from the five parks. The one exception would be Thomas Square, which, as described under Visual Impacts above, includes protected significant public views, including the view of Thomas Square from King Street and the view of the Neal S. Blaisdell Center from Thomas Square, that are defined in Section 21-9.70 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu that would be adverse impacts caused by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. The Section 4(f) use evaluation for Thomas Square is discussed in Table 1.

**Table 6. Parklands Koko Head of Ka'aahi Street Station**

Property	Relationship
A'ala Park	Guideway in tunnel below park
Kamali'i Mini Park	Guideway in tunnel adjacent to park
Thomas Square	Elevated guideway adjacent to park
Pāwa'a Inha Park	Elevated guideway adjacent to park
Old Stadium Park	Elevated guideway adjacent to park
Mō'ili'ili Neighborhood Park	Elevated guideway adjacent to park
Mō'ili'ili Triangle Park	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to park

## Historic Architecture

As shown on Figure 17, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would incorporate land from one NRHP-listed historic property and three eligible historic properties (the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building, McKinley High School, former filling station on the OR&L parcel, and the King Florist Building) and would have station entrances adjacent to the Chinatown Historic District and two additional NRHP-eligible properties (Bethel and Chaplain Lane Building and Schnak Building). The Ka'aahi Street Station would require removal, relocation, or alteration of the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and the former filling station on the OR&L parcel (Figure 5).

In addition to the 4 historic properties from which the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would incorporate land, the elevated guideway would travel adjacent to two listed and 39 properties treated as eligible for listing on the NRHP (Table 7 and Table 8). These are historic and architectural properties that were identified during the Alternatives Analysis process (DTS 2007b). As shown in Figure 17, there is a high concentration of historic properties located on South King Street,



which is a result of the development pattern of Honolulu in the early- and mid-twentieth century.

**Table 7. Affected Properties Listed in or Determined Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places**

Property	Location
1. OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building (NRHP eligible)	Entrances for underground Ka'aahi Street Station located within boundary of historic property
2. Former filling station within OR&L Parcel (NRHP eligible)	Entrances for underground Ka'aahi Street Station located within boundary of historic property
3. Thomas Square (NRHP listed)	Elevated guideway adjacent to park
4. McKinley High School (NRHP listed)	Entrances for aerial Pensacola Street Station located within boundary of historic property
5. Church of the Crossroads (NRHP listed)	Elevated guideway adjacent to property

The FTA, following the process included in 36 CFR 800.5, in consultation with the SHPO, went through an extensive process of evaluating potential impacts on historic properties immediately adjacent to the Project that was approved in the ROD. Eligibility determinations made for the Project used property boundaries as the boundary for eligible historic properties unless there was a barrier or other physical element that provided a more logical boundary for a specific property. The impacts were determined based on age, integrity, integrity of setting, and visual and physical proximity to the historic property (RTD 2009a). The SHPO concurred with the adverse effect determinations made by FTA and identified additional adverse effects that FTA agreed to for historic properties affected by the Project. The ACHP participated in the resolution of effects and signed the Programmatic Agreement (PA) (Attachment 2 to the PA [FTA 2011]). The determined effects included general effects, visual effects, and effects to integrity of setting, feeling, and association.

The City and FTA used this methodology to identify potential effects for the purposes of this Section 4(f) analysis for historic properties adjacent to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. Considering potential effects, including general effects, visual effects, and effects on the integrity of setting, feeling, and association, from the elevated guideway, tunnel portals, and stations, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would impact 47 historic sites that qualify for protection under Section 4(f) and are listed on or likely eligible for the NRHP (Figure 17).

The McCully Street Station would require property along the makai side of South King Street to accommodate the makai edge of the station platform, station entrance building, and TPSS. This would require acquisition and demolition of King Florist, an NRHP-eligible property. The effects on the remaining properties would be the same as, or similar to, the Project's effects on historic properties adjacent to the elevated guideway including general effects, visual effects, and effects on integrity of setting, feeling, and association.

**Table 8. Affected Properties Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places\***

Property	Location	Property	Location
1. Bethel and Chaplain Lane Building	Entrances for underground station located across Bethel Street from building	22. Sushi Sasabune	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
2. Schnak Building	Entrances for underground station located across Bethel Street from building	23. Territorial Board of Agriculture and Forestry Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
3. Board of Water Supply Engineering Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	24. King Center Bank of Hawai'i	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
4. Board of Water Supply Administration Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	25. Professional Center	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
5. First Chinese Church of Christ	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	26. Continental Building	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to property
6. 1-story Deco Building, 1026 S King St	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	27. King Kalākaua Building	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to property
7. Nitta Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	28. Heu Commercial Building	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to property
8. Fukumoto Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	29. Washington Middle School	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
9. Ishikawa 1-story Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	30. Dental Office, 1702 S King St	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
10. Chang Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	31. KNDI Radio	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
11. Chow 1-story Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	32. Miss Hawai'i Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
12. Masui 1-story Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	33. Kimura Florist	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
13. Saiki 1-1/2 Story Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	34. T. Ishibashi Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
14. Wong Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	35. Tenrikyo Honolulu Church	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
15. Precision Radio	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	36. King Florist	Station Entrance and support buildings would displace the property.
16. Clyde's Cleaners	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	37. James M. Chrones Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
17. Mediterraneo	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	38. Ishizuchi Shrine	Elevated guideway and station adjacent to property
18. Dr. A Tsuda Office	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	39. Safety Loan Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
19. Trophy House	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	40. J.C. Tom Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
20. American Stereo	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	41. Choy Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property
21. Ikuta Commercial Building	Elevated guideway adjacent to property	42. HK Restaurant	Elevated guideway adjacent to property

\*These 42 properties were evaluated by qualified architectural historians during the Alternatives Analysis based on age (built before 1967) and review of integrity. Their eligibility for NRHP listing is consistent with guidance provided by the SHPO and eligibility determinations made by the FTA for properties within the Area of Potential Effect of the Project. The elevated guideway would be adjacent to 39 of the properties. Properties 1, 2, and 36 would be affected in different ways.

The construction-phase impacts discussed in the Construction sub-section could create additional adverse effects to historic properties adjacent to the Fort Street Station as a result of limited access or potential damage during construction.

These adverse effects to 47 historic properties would compare to the 15 historic properties between Ka'aahi Street Station and Ala Moana Center identified as adversely affected by the approved Project [Figure 4-77 of the Final EIS/4(f)]. The high concentration of historic commercial buildings on South King Street is in contrast to the combination of mixed-use, industrial, and redeveloped properties along the Project alignment. Overall, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would have an adverse effect on 47 historic properties as compared to 15 with the Project.

## **Archaeology**

The Archaeological Technical Report completed for the Alternatives Analysis identified the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative as extending predominantly over the Honolulu Plain, away from the intensive coastal prehistoric and historic land use (DTS 2007b). No field survey was completed during the Alternatives Analysis; however, substantial information was available from literature review that indicated that the portion of the alignment in a tunnel under Beretania Street is through an area of much higher potential for encountering archaeological deposits and burials than the area along South King Street. The Beretania Street area includes the tunnel portals and excavated stations, which would not disturb any known archaeological features or burials but would have a high potential for encountering unknown archaeological features or burials (DTS 2007b). The area of disturbed ground for each portal or underground station is much greater than for the elevated stations on the Project alignment. In total, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would disturb 13 acres of ground between the Ka'aahi station and UH Mānoa, including tunnel portals, underground stations, column foundations, utility relocations, repaving, and elevated stations. A total of approximately 400,000 cubic yards of material would be excavated during construction of the tunnel portals and underground stations to an average depth of between 50 and 60 feet below the surface. Any archaeological resources encountered in the portal and station areas could not be avoided.

The surveys for previously unidentified below-ground archaeological sites required by the PA among FTA, the City, the U.S. Navy, the SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation have been completed for the entirety of the project alignment. The results of the below-ground surveys along the project alignment are reported in several volumes of an archaeological inventory survey report (HART 2010, HART 2012d, HART 2013a, HART 2013b). The surveys were conducted in accordance with survey protocols and procedures approved by the State Historic Preservation Division. In construction phases 1 and 2, no human skeletal remains were encountered. Two NRHP-eligible archaeological sites were documented in phases 1 and 2. In each case, they were determined eligible under Criterion D for their information potential. Two NRHP-eligible sites

were documented in construction phase 3, also eligible under Criterion D. No human remains were encountered.

The surveys identified 19 NRHP-eligible archaeological sites in construction phase 4. All these sites are eligible for their informational value only under Criterion D of the Advisory Council regulations. Human skeletal remains were documented in seven trenches within four of the 19 sites in construction phase 4. The SHPO accepted the results of the final archaeological inventory surveys for the Airport and City Center phases on August 26, 2013. In the acceptance letter, the SHPO concurred that eligibility for listing of the sites in the NRHP was only under Criterion D, for sites that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history [Appendix D to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)].

The Section 4(f) Policy Paper (USDOT 2012) provides the following guidance on Section 4(f) applicability to archaeological resources:

Section 4(f) does not apply if FHWA determines, after consultation with the SHPO/THPO, federally recognized Indian tribes (as appropriate), and the ACHP (if participating) that the archeological resource is important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery (even if it is agreed not to recover the resource) and has minimal value for preservation in place, and the SHPO/THPO and ACHP (if participating) does not object to this determination [See 23 CFR 774.13(b)].

Each NRHP-eligible archaeological site identified during the AIS process was identified as eligible under Criterion D of 36 CFR 60.4. The evaluations of eligibility document that the sites are eligible under Criterion D, exclusively for their information potential (HART 2013e). Nine sites are planned for data recovery, including eight sites within construction phase 4. As noted in the PA, the Project would comply with Hawai'i Administrative Rules and recommendations of the O'ahu Island Burial Council for any Native Hawaiian burials. Construction monitoring is planned for all sites. Data recovery and burial treatment plans will be prepared and implemented during construction. After opportunity for public comment, the SHPO concurred with these determinations in a series of acceptance letters in 2013 [Appendix D to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)].

Because the sites are eligible for their information potential only, they are "important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery." Consistent with 23 CFR 774.13(b), Section 4(f) does not apply to the archaeological sites identified during the Project's AIS.

HART previously agreed that in the event any NRHP burials are identified during the archaeological inventory survey, the design of the Project would be modified to allow preservation of the burials in place and thus avoid any "use" of the site. HART has modified the design of the Project to avoid all the previously identified




human remains in phase 4. Under Hawai'i law, the final determination regarding treatment of previously identified human skeletal remains is made by the O'ahu Island Burial Council and the State Historic Preservation Division. Regardless of the final determination, HART has modified the design of the Project to avoid any Section 4(f) use of the previously identified human skeletal remains. Overall, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is located in an area with a lower potential to encounter archaeological resources and burials than the Project; however, the alignment, station locations, and portal locations for a tunnel are much less flexible than the column locations for an elevated guideway. As a result, the potential impact at the portals and stations is higher for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative than for the Project, which would disturb a limited area at column footings and stations. The Project would disturb eight acres of land for column foundations, utility relocations, repaving, and elevated stations, which is five acres less than the area that would be disturbed by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

## **Construction**

The construction methods for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative and the Project are different [Section 3.4 of this Final EIS/4(f) discusses tunnel construction methods]. Construction duration would be approximately two years longer than for the Project (Figure 13). Tunnel construction would require a large area at the 'Ewa portal to launch the TBM and support the removal and dewatering of tunnel spoils (material removed from the tunnel). This area would be in use for the duration of the tunnel construction.

Tunnel construction would also require an area around each underground station and the Koko Head portal to allow for excavation (Figure 25). The top of the bored tunnel would be between 20 and 40 feet below the surface and the construction of stations would include digging a large pit to this depth at each station. The areas affected by the excavation for each station are shown on Figure 25 and the staging is discussed for each station individually. The duration of construction would be much longer and the area required larger for tunnel stations than for elevated stations. The total area of construction easements required for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would be approximately 18 acres, compared to 9 acres required Koko Head of Iwilei for the Project.

Comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) raised the issue of karst formations (freshwater-eroded sub-surface limestone caves) in the corridor. Extensive geotechnical testing, including borings at pier locations, has been conducted for the Project. No karst formations have been identified that would be affected by the Project. In the Chinatown and downtown area, the Beretania Street Tunnel would be mauka of the alignment for the Project and travel through an area with coralline rock that could contain karst formations. The TBM used to excavate the tunnel would be designed to operate in these ground conditions. A large karst formation does exist near the Koko Head limit of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative (Halliday 1998). Foundations for the elevated guideway in the King Street and University Avenue



**Figure 25. Tunnel Portal and Tunnel Station Area Disturbance during Construction**

vicinity would have to be designed to account for underground voids. Construction of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would impact these formations.

Additionally, the Hawai'i Department of Health's (HDOH) records indicate that soil excavated from the 'Ewa portal area of the Beretania Street Tunnel could contain high levels of soil contamination (HDOH 2013). In March 13, 2006, HDOH informed the Hawai'i Department of Community Services that the former Von Hamm Textiles property, located at 546 Ka'aahi Street (TMK 1-1-5-007:050), contains lead contamination. The concentration of lead in the soil (658 mg/kg, located between approximately 5 and 6.5 feet below the ground surface) "may pose a direct exposure threat to humans in residential exposure settings as well as terrestrial ecological impacts." At that time, a determination of "no further action" was issued by the HDOH since the existing building was to remain in place and the soil would remain covered by the building's foundation. The letter concludes by stating that if the building is demolished or the floor of the building is disturbed or underlying soil is exposed, a potential exposure hazard may exist and additional coordination with HDOH would be required. Additional samples in the Ka'aahi Street area have detected lead in concentrations up to 4,700 mg/kg as well as total petroleum hydrocarbons (gasoline range) at 1,100 mg/kg and total petroleum hydrocarbons (residual range) at 4,600 mg/kg, all of which are above HDOH Environmental Action Levels. The excavation for the Beretania Street Tunnel would occur on and adjacent to the properties where contamination has been encountered and could release contamination and, therefore, would require additional public and worker safety precautions and potential remediation, transport, and disposal of significant volumes of soil generated from the property.

In total, approximately 490,000 cubic yards of spoils would be removed from the tunnel and stations and require disposal. This would result in approximately 49,000 round-trip truck trips to and from the Ka'aahi Street portal site if typical 10-yard dump trucks are used. If construction occurs six days per week over the approximately five-year tunnel construction period (Figure 13), there would be an average of 63 one-way truck trips to or from the site per day to transport the tunnel spoils.

A currently vacant former auto dealership along with six parcels that would be acquired on the makai side of Ka'aahi Street near the 'Ewa portal would provide sufficient space to stage tunnel construction. Construction beginning at the 'Ewa portal and extending through the Ka'aahi Street Station would be cut-and-cover (excavated down from the surface, then re-covered once the station structure is constructed to support the cover). A TBM would bore the two parallel tunnels from the Ka'aahi Street Station to the Koko Head Portal.

The Ka'aahi Street Station and the tunnel staging area is constrained by the surrounding historic OR&L buildings. Construction would require relocation, demolition, or temporary support of at least one of the buildings and closure of the parking lot, requiring alternative access to the State of Hawai'i Department of Human Services offices. The makai lanes of King Street would be temporarily



closed, first to relocate utilities, then for construction of the Koko Head end of the Ka'aahi Street Station. Tunneling below the water table through mixed ground conditions would include a risk of settlement and damage to adjacent buildings, including the NRHP-listed Chinatown and Hawai'i Capital Historic Districts.

The Fort Street Station also would be constructed using a cut-and-cover method by excavating from above. During construction, the entire parking lot between Nu'uani Avenue and Bethel Street at Beretania Street would be used for staging. Construction of the station would require closure of lanes in Beretania Street and a portion of adjacent streets for periods extending up to several months. The total station construction duration for underground stations would be approximately 33 months for each station compared to 21 months for elevated stations. Over the nearly three-year station construction period, the station would be excavated from above in three stages to maintain traffic on three or four of Beretania Street's six lanes during peak periods. Once the shell of the station is complete, the roadway would be restored above it and the station would be finished from inside. In contrast, construction of the elevated guideway and the Chinatown Station for the Project would require substantially shorter periods of lane closures on Nimitz Highway, totaling only a few months of the 21-month construction duration, both because of the segmental construction technique used for the elevated structure and because much of the Chinatown Station will be located outside the Nimitz Highway right-of-way on what is currently a parking lot.

The City and County of Honolulu Board of Water Supply indicated in its comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) dated July 18, 2013 that a new water main is planned for construction under portions of Beretania Street and could be in conflict with a transit tunnel in that location. The design would require additional coordination.

The Koko Head portal would require reconfiguration and reconstruction of a portion of the municipal parking garage near Beretania Street and Alapai Street. The construction would require closure of the two makai lanes of Beretania Street at various times, extending for up to several months. Because of the limited space at the Koko Head portal, the TBM would have to be dismantled and returned to the 'Ewa end to bore the second tunnel. The closures and restrictions would be temporary and, after construction, the facilities would be reopened.

Construction of the elevated section and stations along South King Street would be more rapid than in the tunnel section, similar to construction of the Project; however, South King Street is a major arterial that provides one of the few 'Ewa to Koko Head connections through the city center. According to 2007 traffic counts (RTD 2009), King Street carries approximately 1,600 cars per hour in the vicinity of Cooke Street, while Halekauwila carries approximately 700 cars per hour. The much greater traffic volumes on King Street would result in greater traffic impacts during the construction phase than for the Project.

Unlike the Project, where the guideway would generally run along the center of streets, the guideway would run along the makai side of King Street, creating a greater impact on properties along the makai side during construction. Access to Neal S. Blaisdell Center would be restricted from King Street but maintained from Kapi'olani Boulevard during construction. While sidewalk access to businesses along King Street would be maintained during construction, street parking in the construction area would be eliminated, making access to small businesses more difficult. Driveway access from King Street to parking lots would be maintained to the extent feasible but would be closed at certain times, such as utility relocation across the driveways, repaving of portions of South King Street, or when guideway sections are being placed over the entrance.

Construction noise would be of similar magnitude to that described in Section 4.18.5 of the Final EIS/4(f) for the Project, except at the launch and retrieval sites of the TBM and at construction areas where the removal and dewatering of tunnel spoils are conducted. These activities would have potential noise and vibration impacts on sensitive land uses in their vicinity.

### **3.5.4 Costs of an Extraordinary Magnitude**

The fourth test for prudence is if the alternative would result in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of an extraordinary magnitude. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would increase the capital cost of the Project (the cost to construct) by \$960 million in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars (Table 9). YOE-dollar cost estimates include inflation to the date of the expenditure, while dated-dollar cost estimates reflect prices in the given fiscal year. Cost estimation was completed following FTA methodology using standard cost categories (SCC) for transit projects. The SCC are a standardized breakdown of common elements that make up the capital cost for a transit project. Cost estimates were originally completed in 2006 dollars during the Alternatives Analysis phase of the Project, then updated and adjusted for inflation to 2009 and YOE dollars for the Final EIS/4(f). Capital costs for only the portion of the corridor Koko Head of Iwilei are shown for each SCC in Table 10 to detail the differences in cost between the alternatives that are shown in Table 9. Costs for the maintenance and storage facility and vehicles are project wide; therefore, they are not calculated for individual sections of the Project.

According to projections from the Final EIS/4(f), which have been supported by the execution of a Full Funding Grant Agreement between HART and the FTA, \$5,544 million (YOE) is the total of anticipated available funds from all sources to construct the Project [Table 6-4 of the Final EIS/4(f)]. In addition to capital costs, the funds must also cover interest and finance charges, estimated in the Final EIS/4(f) to total \$398 million (YOE) for the Project. These interest and finance charges would be greater for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative because additional borrowing would be required to pay for the higher capital cost of the alternative. The 19-percent increase in capital costs (YOE) for the Beretania



Street Tunnel Alternative would be greater than all available funding sources and would exceed available funding for contingencies.

During the December 12, 2012 remedy hearing before the District Court, plaintiffs suggested that the additional costs of a tunnel could be offset by shortening the system at the 'Ewa end. Shortening the system to end at the Leeward Community College Station (Figure 1), which is adjacent to the maintenance and storage site, would reduce project cost by approximately \$580 million in 2009 dollars. According to Figure 3-10 of the Final EIS/4(f), 23,680 daily boardings (20 percent of all rail boardings) are projected at stations that would be eliminated by shortening the system to Leeward Community College.

**Table 9. Capital Costs Excluding Finance Charges**

Capital Costs	The Project	Beretania Street Tunnel	Difference from the Project
2006 \$M	4,190	4,840	650
2009 \$M	4,280	5,030	750
YOE* \$M	5,120	6,080	960

\* Year of Expenditure

2009 and YOE cost values for the Project are from the Final EIS/4(f), Table 6-1. 2006 project cost values are from the Alternatives Analysis, Table 5-1. Values for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative were calculated using the same methodology and assumptions. All costs are rounded to the nearest 10 million.

**Table 10. Standard Cost Categories Comparison of Alternatives Koko Head of Iwilei (2006 \$M)**

SCC	Category Description	The Project*	Beretania Street Tunnel*
10.0	Guideway and Track	\$133	\$340
20.0	Aerial & Underground Stations	\$46	\$223
30.0	Yards, Shops, Admin Facilities	Not Included	Not Included
40.0	Sitework & Special Conditions	\$136	\$103
50.0	Systems	\$24	\$39
	<b>Sub-total Construction Costs (SCC 10—50)</b>	<b>\$339</b>	<b>\$705</b>
	Construction Contingency (SCC 10—50)	\$98	\$202
	Other Construction Cost Adjustments (including GET)	\$24	\$49
60.0	ROW, Land, Existing Improvements	\$33	\$12
	ROW Contingency (SCC 60)	\$17	\$6
70.0	Vehicles	Not Included	Not Included
80.0	Soft Costs	\$138	\$287
90.0	Contingency (Project Reserve)	\$39	\$76
	<b>Total Alternative Costs</b>	<b>\$688</b>	<b>\$1,337</b>

\*All values are in millions of 2006 dollars

Source: Updated from the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project Final Capital Costing Memorandum (DTS, 2006)

Further shortening the alignment at the 'Ewa end, so that it does not extend to Leeward Community College, would prevent the system from being operable because it would not reach the maintenance and storage site (Figure 1). Other potential maintenance and storage site options are located even farther 'Ewa of the selected site [Section 2.5.8 of the Final EIS/4(f)].

Shortening to Leeward Community College would not save the needed \$750 million (2009 dollars), it would have a major effect on system ridership and would not meet the Purpose and Need element related to improving access to planned development to support City and State policies to focus new development in the 'Ewa plain to minimize urban sprawl and reliance on the private auto. The shortened system would fail to reach the 'Ewa plain. Transit from that region would continue to be limited to unreliable bus service operating in congested mixed traffic. Shortening the system in such a way would not be prudent because such major changes to the project would make it unreasonable to proceed with the project in light of the project's purpose and need.

### **3.5.5     *Unique Problems or Unusual Factors***

The fifth test for prudence is if the alternative would cause unique problems or have unusual factors. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would delay system opening by approximately two years. The nature of tunnel construction also introduces additional risks resulting in increased cost and schedule uncertainty associated with tunneling. The cost of the delay has been captured in the year of expenditure cost estimate, but the delay in benefits to system users would be an additional impact.

### **3.5.6     *Cumulative Consideration of Factors***

The final test for prudence is if the alternative would involve multiple factors that are individually minor but would cumulatively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude. The impacts on parks and historic properties; settlement risks from tunnel construction; environmental effects related to visual, historic architecture, and traffic and business access disruption during construction; delayed benefits from the system; and the extraordinary increase in the cost of the alternative all contribute to the determination that the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is not prudent. Cumulatively, the severe environmental effects and extraordinary increase in the cost of the alternative make the Beretania Street Alternative not prudent.

### 3.6 Overall Feasibility and Prudence of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would not be a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative because it would use other Section 4(f) properties. It is feasible to construct the alternative as a matter of engineering, but it is not a prudent alternative because of its extraordinary cost and other factors such as environmental impacts and long-term construction impacts. The impacts on parks and historic properties; settlement risks from tunnel construction; environmental effects related to visual, historic architecture, and traffic and business access disruption during construction; and delayed benefits from this alternative would contribute to the imprudence of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. The overall extraordinary increase in the cost of the alternative alone would make the alternative imprudent.

### 3.7 Least Overall Harm

A feasible and prudent avoidance alternative is one that completely avoids all Section 4(f) property. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is not a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative. Per 23 CFR Part 774.3(c), if there is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative, then FTA may approve, from among the remaining alternatives that use Section 4(f) property, the alternative that causes the least overall harm in light of the statute's preservation purpose. This least overall harm analysis is required when a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative is not identified [Section 1.2.3 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. Although not required by the Summary Judgment Order, this document contains an analysis of which alternative would have "least overall harm" to resources protected by Section 4(f) in compliance with the Section 4(f) regulations.

Both the Project and the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would have the same effect on Section 4(f) properties 'Ewa of Ka'aahi Street because both alternatives are identical in that area. Both alternatives would have temporary occupancy of two recreational resources (Pearl Harbor Bike Path and Future Middle Loch Park) and *de minimis* direct use on three recreational resources (Aloha Stadium, Ke'ehi Lagoon Beach Park, and Pacific War Memorial Site). Also, both alternatives would have identical non-*de minimis* direct use of seven historic properties (Afuso House, Higa Four-plex, Teixeira House, Lava Rock Curbs, Kapālama Canal Bridge, Six Quonset Huts, and True Kamani Trees) and *de minimis* impact of one historic property (Boulevard Saimin). Therefore, the remainder of this section considers Section 4(f) properties Koko Head of Ka'aahi Street.

Per 23 CFR 774.7(c), the consideration of impacts includes both objective, quantifiable impacts and qualitative measures that provide a more subjective assessment of harm. The factors considered in the least overall harm analysis are detailed in Section 1.2.3 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). Neither

alternative would have any Section 4(f) use of parks in this portion of the corridor; therefore, the least overall harm analysis is limited to historic properties.

### ***3.7.1 The Ability to Mitigate Adverse Impacts on each Section 4(f) Property (including any measures that result in benefits to the property)***

The Project resulted in a Section 106 programmatic agreement to mitigate adverse effects to historic properties. Mitigation includes preparation of NRHP nomination forms for each historic property found to be adversely affected through the Section 106 process, including all properties the Project would use. Mitigation also includes historic property documentation of the OR&L Station and Document Storage Building, Dillingham Transportation Building, and the HECO Downtown Plant/Leslie A. Hicks Building. General mitigation for overall project-related effects includes \$2 million for an historic preservation program, in addition to historic context studies, cultural landscape reports, and educational and interpretive programs, material, and signage.

Were the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative selected as the build alternative, the Programmatic Agreement would be amended to mitigate effects to the newly affected historic properties. There are more historic properties along the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative than the Project. Based on the effect determinations for the Project, even with mitigation, the effect on these properties would likely be adverse under Section 106.

The ability to mitigate adverse effects would be similar for both alternatives. Both alternatives would implement similar mitigation measures as defined in the PA. However, the Beretania Tunnel Street Alternative would require mitigation for more properties than is required for the Project.

### ***3.7.2 The Relative Severity of the Remaining Harm, after Mitigation, to the Protected Activities, Attributes, or Features that Qualify Each Section 4(f) Property for Protection***


Table 11 summarizes impacts to historic properties for both alternatives after all possible planning to minimize harm. The Project would create uses of four Section 4(f) properties within this portion of the corridor, all of which are historic properties. The impacts described in the Final EIS/4(f) are the result of all possible planning to minimize harm (see definition in 23 CFR 774.17). All possible planning to minimize harm from the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, pursuant to 23 CFR 774.3(a)(1), is described in Section 3.3.

The Project's permanent and construction impacts would use land from historic properties, but it would not alter or physically affect any historic buildings or contributing elements to the historic properties. The Project would have adverse


**Table 11. Comparison of Remaining Harm Between Alternatives**

Resource	Section 4(f) Property	Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative		The Project	
		Impact	Type of Use	Impact	Type of Use
OR&L Office/ Document Storage Building and Terminal Building	NRHP-eligible historic property	Removal, relocation, or alteration to support the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building in place during construction. Substantial disturbance including loss of access to the OR&L Terminal Building during construction. Permanent station entrance within boundary of the historic property.	Direct use	Construction of elevated guideway on a planned access easement through this large OR&L parcel as it extends from Dillingham Boulevard to Nimitz Highway. No structures would be altered.	Direct use
Former filling station on OR&L parcel	NRHP-eligible historic property	Removal, relocation, or alteration to support facility in place during construction. Permanent station entrance within boundary of the historic property.	Direct use	Construction of elevated guideway on a planned access easement through this large OR&L parcel as it extends from Dillingham Boulevard to Nimitz Highway.	( <i>de minimis</i> )
Chinatown	NRHP-listed historic district	Construction within roadway right-of-way inside boundary of historic district.	None	Permanent station entrance within a parking lot that is on a parcel containing properties that are contributing elements to the Chinatown Historic District. Permanent station entrance beside modern buildings in a parking lot within the historic district boundary.	Direct use
Dillingham Transportation Building	NRHP-listed historic property	None	None	Permanent station entrance will be sited on a modern plaza next to the Dillingham Transportation Building on the same parcel.	Direct use
HECO Downtown Plant/Leslie A. Hicks Building	NRHP-eligible historic property	None	None	Associated features of the transit station will be located immediately mauka of and in the location of a small addition to the 1929 building within its NRHP boundary. These features require that the metal roof of this extension be demolished. This extension is not a contributing element that makes this property eligible for the NRHP.	Direct use
McKinley High School	NRHP-listed historic property	Permanent station entrance within a non-contributing open space within the boundary of the historic property.	Direct Use	None	None
King Florist Building	Historic property treated as NRHP-eligible	Demolition of historic property and use of property for a permanent station entrance.	Direct use	None	None
Summary of use		Demolition, removal, relocation, or alteration of three historic properties. Direct use of four Section 4(f) properties.		Use is limited to construction within the boundary of a history property. No removal, relocation, or alteration of historic structures. Direct use of four Section 4(f) properties. <i>De minimis</i> impact of one Section 4(f) property.	





**Figure 26. Section 4(f) Use by the Project in the Chinatown Area**



**Figure 27. Section 4(f) Use by the Project in the Downtown Area**

visual and setting effects to the historic buildings and contributing elements to the historic properties. None of the visual effects would diminish the protected activities, features, or attributes of the properties to the extent that they would be substantially impaired. Although the Project would directly use property from the OR&L parcel, Chinatown Historic District, the Dillingham Transportation Building, and the HECO Downtown Plant/Leslie A. Hicks Building, combined uses of the parcels would be 39,600 square feet and there would be no direct use of any contributing buildings and the properties would maintain their eligibility for listing on the NRHP (Figure 26 and Figure 27). The Project would not have an adverse effect to the former filling station on the OR&L parcel, which was determined eligible for listing on the NRHP. The Project would have a *de minimis* impact on the former filling station on the OR&L parcel.

The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would use four Section 4(f) properties (Figure 18, Figure 19, and Figure 20). Both alternatives would impact the historic properties on the OR&L parcel, but in significantly different ways. For the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, permanent and construction impacts would use a total of 163,200 square feet. A majority of that use would result from construction impacts to 141,100 square feet at the OR&L parcel. Cut-and-cover construction of the Ka'aahi Station would require removal, relocation, or alteration of the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and the former filling station on the OR&L parcel (Figure 5) resulting in a use of these properties. The properties likely would not retain sufficient integrity to maintain their eligibility for listing on the NRHP. Permanent impacts at the King Florist Building would demolish the historic property, which is likely NRHP-eligible.

Table 11 summarizes the remaining harm to Section 4(f) properties for both alternatives. The Project would have the least remaining harm, because it has no impacts to historic buildings or contributing elements of historic properties. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would use four historic properties and would have over 110,000 square feet more construction impact within historic properties.

### **3.7.3 The Relative Significance of Each Section 4(f) Property**

The historic 4(f) properties used by the Project are OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building, Chinatown Historic District, the Dillingham Transportation Building, and the HECO Downtown Plant/Leslie A. Hicks Building. Chinatown and the Dillingham Transportation Building are listed in the NRHP. These properties were listed in the 1970s and are among some of the earliest properties in Hawai'i that were listed on the NRHP. The effort committed to list these historic properties on the NRHP is a demonstration of their relative significance as historic properties in Honolulu. The portions of each property being used are non-contributing elements and, in the case of Chinatown and the Dillingham Transportation Building, the areas being used had been previously altered outside each property's period of significance. The OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building, and HECO Downtown

Plant/Leslie A. Hicks Building are not currently listed on the NRHP but have been determined eligible for listing. The impact of the Project would occur in a non-contributing, out-of-period extension to the original HECO Downtown Plant/Leslie A. Hicks Building.

The historic properties that the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would use are the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building, former filling station on the OR&L parcel, McKinley High School, and the King Florist Building. McKinley High School is listed in the NRHP. The OR&L parcel contains the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building and the former filling station, which were determined individually eligible for the NRHP during Section 106 consultation for the Project. The King Florist Building was built in 1945 and was identified during the Alternatives Analysis (DTS 2006) as potentially eligible for the NRHP.

Two of the four historic Section 4(f) properties used by the Project are significant as demonstrated by their listing in the NRHP. Along the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, one of the four historic properties that would be used is NRHP-listed.

#### ***3.7.4 The Views of the Official(s) with Jurisdiction over Each Section 4(f) Property***

The official with jurisdiction over historic properties is the SHPO. The SHPO's views on the Project's impacts are reflected in the Project's PA, in which the SHPO concurred with the FTA's "adverse effect" finding under Section 106 of the NHPA for the four properties with Section 4(f) uses. The only exception to that is the King Florist Building, which was not included in the Section 106 consultation because it would not have been used by the Project. The Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), including the assessment of the King Florist Building, was circulated to the SHPO for review and comment on May 31, 2013. The SHPO did not comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f).

Because the project elements that would cause impact are about the same between alternatives, it is unlikely that officials' views would vary significantly between the alternatives.

#### ***3.7.5 The Degree to which Each Alternative Meets the Purpose and Need of the Project***

Each alternative's performance regarding purpose and need is described in Section 3.5.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). The alternatives are about equal in the degree to which they meet purpose and need.

### **3.7.6     *After Reasonable Mitigation, the Magnitude of any Adverse Impacts to Resources Not Protected by Section 4(f)***

This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) provides a comparison of social, economic, environmental, and community impacts that result from both alternatives in Section 3.5.3. Section 3.5.3 also discusses construction impacts. Tunnel construction would cause construction impacts at both portals (near Ka'aahi Street and the Alapai Bus Transit Center) as well as cut-and-cover construction of both subsurface stations. Construction of the Beretania Tunnel would take at least two years longer than for the Project, resulting in a longer duration of impacts related to construction.

At Fort Street Station, the entire Beretania Street roadway right-of-way would have some type of utility relocation trenches from approximately Smith Street (in Chinatown) to Fort Street Mall and extend down about 200 feet on both the mauka and makai sides of Nu'uaniu, Bethel, and Fort Streets. Beretania Street, Nu'uaniu Avenue, and Bethel Streets may need to be temporarily closed during off-peak periods for utility relocations and installation of heavy equipment. Entire street closures would not affect more than one street at a time. Two lanes of traffic on Beretania Street may need to be closed during peak periods for several months to install retaining wall supports.

For the Koko Head portal, construction would require the same off-peak roadway closure requirements for Beretania Street, Alapai Street, and Punchbowl Street. There would be a two-lane closure on Beretania Street during peak periods. The City's underground parking between the driveway extension of Hotel Street and Beretania Street would be closed during construction of the Koko Head tunnel portal. The vacant parcel on the 'Ewa side of the newly constructed Alapai Bus Transit Center could be used as a laydown area.

After reasonable mitigation, the Beretania Tunnel Street Alternative would have a greater magnitude of adverse impacts regarding historic architecture, construction duration, and construction-related traffic impacts. Impacts to other non-Section 4(f) resources discussed in the Final EIS/4(f) would be different for each alignment but generally equal in magnitude.

### **3.7.7     *Substantial Differences in Costs among the Alternatives***

Section 3.5.4 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) discusses the differences in costs between the two alternatives. As detailed above, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would cost about \$650 million (2006 dollars) more than the Project, which translates to \$960 million (YOE) in capital costs more than the Project (Table 9). As described in Section 3.5.4, the 19-percent increase in project costs (YOE) for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would result in project costs being greater than all available funding sources and would exceed



available funding for contingencies. No additional sources have been identified that could fund the \$960 million (YOE) cost increase.

### 3.7.8 Summary

The least overall harm analysis focuses on seven factors that must be balanced to identify the alternative that causes the least harm in light of the Section 4(f) statute's preservationist purpose. This analysis shows that, on balance, the Project alternative causes the least overall harm for the reasons summarized in Table 12. Overall, the Project would use more Section 4(f) properties with high relative significance; however, the nature of the use would be substantially different for the Project compared to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative (Table 11). Project uses are limited to construction of station entrances or easements within the boundary of a history property. The Project would not require any removal, relocation, or alteration of historic structures, with no alteration or demolition of buildings or structures. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would require removal, relocation, or alteration of two historic properties at the OR&L parcel and require demolition of the King Florist Building. Also, the capital cost for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would be about \$960 million (YOE) more than for the Project.

**Table 12. Summary of Least Overall Harm**

Factor	Least Harm Alternative	Comments
Ability to mitigate	About equal	Either alternative would include specified mitigation per Section 106. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative might require more mitigation than the Project owing to more historic properties and more parks.
Remaining harm and relative significance	The Project would have least remaining harm	The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative and the Project would both have direct use of four Section 4(f) properties. The Project would also have one de minimis impact. Project uses are limited to construction of station entrances or easements within the boundary of a history property. The Project would not require any removal, relocation, or alteration of historic structures. In addition to station entrances on historic properties, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would require removal, relocation, or alteration to support in place two historic properties at the OR&L parcel during construction and require demolition of the King Florist Building.
View of officials	About equal	Impacts to historic properties from either alternative would result in specified mitigation, and neither alternative would result in a direct use of parks. Given the similarity of the guideway in both alternatives, the impacts would be of the same nature and type. The nature of the affected properties, however, varies.
Purpose and need	About equal	Each alternative performs similarly regarding purpose and need.
Non-Section 4(f) impacts	The Project	While potential for most impacts discussed in the Final EIS/4(f) are different but generally equal, potential impacts to historic architecture and construction impacts would be more severe for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.
Substantial difference in cost	The Project	The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would cost \$960 million (YOE) more than the Project.



## ***Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground***

---

The District Court's Summary Judgment Order dated November 1, 2012, ordered a reconsideration of the no-use determination for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park, taking full account of evidence that the Project will significantly affect the park. Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground is eligible for protection under Section 4(f) as both a public park and historic property.

### **4.1 Description of the Property**

Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park is a 3.4-acre urban park bounded by Coral, Halekauwila, Cooke, and Pohukaina Streets (Figure 28). Portions of the park are owned by the City and County of Honolulu, State of Hawai'i, and Hawai'i Community Development Authority (HCDA), a State agency. The park is managed and maintained by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation.

Mother Waldron Playground is the 1.5-acre remnant of a 1.8-acre historic playground site built by the Works Progress Administration in 1937. The remaining portion of the original playground is entirely located within the current boundary of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park (Figure 28). Between 1991 and 1993, Halekauwila Street was realigned through the mauka portion of Mother Waldron Playground, approximately 90 feet makai of its original alignment, to make the street continuous between Keawe Street and Cooke Street.

The park was expanded in the 'Ewa and Koko Head directions by incorporating previously industrial property and the adjacent right-of-way for Coral Street and Lana Lane. The expanded area outside the boundary walls is a combination of grass-covered and paved open-space. Along Pohukaina Street, road widening associated with district improvements forced the makai perimeter wall and benches to be removed and reconstructed approximately 5 to 10 feet inside the playground's original boundary. To open Mother Waldron Playground to its newly acquired 54,000 square feet, a boundary wall running along Lana Lane and intersecting with the rear of the comfort station, which had separated the original playground from the adjacent commercial development, was removed and never replaced. The original handball court was also removed and never replaced.


The Halekauwila Street realignment eliminated approximately 12,700 square feet of the original playground area. The playground area was reconfigured to fit into the smaller space, including removal of a basketball court, volleyball court, parallel bars, swings, see-saw, and sandbox. The Koko Head boundary wall was removed mauka of the comfort station, and the mauka boundary wall was reconstructed in a modified configuration approximately 90 feet makai of its original location (Figure 29), substantially reducing the area of the playground.





**Figure 28. Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park Vicinity**





**Figure 29. Original Mother Waldron Playground and Current Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park Boundaries**

The playground area in the mauka portion of the park was again reconfigured around 2006, adding a children's climbing structure.

The park is located in a mixed commercial, residential, and industrial area of Kaka'ako. The park is surrounded by open lots, a large surface parking lot, warehouses, and low- and high-rise residential buildings. Park improvements were made in the Coral Street corridor portion of the park in 2011. Current mauka, 'Ewa, makai, and Koko Head views from the park are shown on Figure 30.

Every building adjacent to the original playground has been demolished or replaced. The roadways on two sides of the playground have been assimilated into the current park. Halekauwila Street has been realigned to within the original boundary of the park (Figure 29 and Figure 31) on the mauka end. Pohukaina Street has been widened, relocating the makai boundary wall and pushing the sidewalk into the park on the makai end.

#### ***4.1.1 Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park Recreational Activities, Features, and Attributes Eligible for Protection under Section 4(f)***

The current recreational features of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park include a playground with a climbing structure, basketball courts, volleyball courts, benches, and open grass areas that are used for informal sporting activities, picnicking, and daytime resting. Students from Voyager Public Charter School use the park. A farmers' market with a typical attendance of five vendors and 75 customers per week is held at the park on Monday mornings.

The City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation confirmed that basketball, playground, picnicking, and volleyball are the activities designated for the park (DPR 2012). Between 2009 and 2012, the Department of Parks and Recreation has permitted various organized uses of the park (Table 13).

A survey of park activity was conducted between November 9, 2012 and November 20, 2012. Eleven spot-visits were completed during park open hours and a single visit during park closure hours (Table 14). By far, the primary use of the park is by a "resident population" during park-open hours, who have sleeping mats, blankets, food coolers, bags, and wash and dry laundry around the comfort station. Nighttime observation indicated that this group of daytime users leaves the park during its hours of closure. Use by this resident population is concentrated around the comfort station, is based on the availability of the park, and is not sensitive to setting.





**Figure 30. Existing Views from Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park**





Original photograph did not include scale.

**Figure 31. 1952 USGS Aerial Photograph of Mother Waldron Playground and Surrounding Area**

Walkers, joggers, and dog walkers using or crossing the park were the second-most frequently observed use, followed by basketball, play-structure, and bicycling. Observed organized sporting events included a youth sports day and coaching of youth basketball skills. The majority of recreational use occurs in the makai portion of the park. Only the limited use of the play-structure is located adjacent to Halekauwila Street. Non-recreational uses included a weekly farmers' market and food bank delivery to neighborhood elderly.

With the continued urbanization and increased residential density in the vicinity of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park, the use of the park is anticipated to increase. The increased neighborhood activity may, over time, displace the current resident population, which accounts for the majority of current park use.



**Table 13. Permitted Uses and Events at Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park (2009–2012)**

Date(s)	Organization/Event	Times	Facility/Area	Attendance
8/2/2009	USA Track and Field/Race staging	2:30–5:00 pm	Field/restrooms	80
12/30/2010	Plug in America/Green-Renewable Energy Event	6:00 am–7:00 pm	Field/restrooms	250
8/2011–present	Voyager Charter School/P.E. classes	M–F/8–2 pm	Field/courts/restrooms	100
1/2012–6/2012	Ke Aloha Ho'okahi Preschool/P.E. activities, picnics	Various	Field/restrooms	35
2/2012–4/2012	Hawai'i Jokgu Association/Jokgu League	Sundays 2:00–7:00 pm	Volleyball court/restrooms	25
3/17/2012	Hawai'i Jokgu Association/Jokgu Tournament	7:30 am–7:00 pm	Volleyball court/restrooms	45
Various (1–2 times/year)	Hawai'i 5-0/film staging, crew rest area	5:00 am– 5:00 pm	Field/parking/restrooms	100

**Table 14. Observed Use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park**

Date and Time	Basketball	Play-structure	Walking/Jogging	Sitting/Sleeping	Organized Sport	Bicycling	Other Non-recreation
Nov. 9, 2012, 5 pm			4	8			
Nov. 10, 2012, 9 am			1	7			3 maintenance/construction
Nov. 11, 2012, 2 pm	4	1	1	15	36		
Nov. 12, 2012, 11 am			1	21			8 farmers' market (low turn-out on holiday)
Nov. 13, 2012, 7 am			2	10		1	18 awaiting food bank
Nov. 13, 2012, 6 pm	1			11			
Nov. 14, 2012, 3 pm			1	15		1	
Nov. 15, 2012, 7 pm				8		2	
Nov. 16, 2012, 1 pm	18	3	2	10			1 park maintenance
Nov. 18, 2012, 11 pm				2			
Nov. 19, 2012, 12 pm	1	2	6	10			
Nov. 20, 2012, 4 pm	2	3		14			
Total	26	9	18	131	36	4	30 various activities

#### **4.1.2 Historic Elements Eligible for Protection under Section 4(f)**

Mother Waldron Playground was listed on the Hawai'i Register of Historic Places on June 9, 1988 (prior to the Halekauwila Street realignment) as an element of the thematic group "City & County of Honolulu Art Deco Parks." The state listing noted the park as significant for its associations with the playground movement, both nationally and locally, as well as its architectural and landscape design by Harry Sims Bent. This park is considered one of Bent's best playground designs and a good example of Art Deco/Art Moderne styles in hardscape. The state listing identified recreation and architecture as areas of significance. Mother Waldron Playground is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the national playground movement, which aimed to provide supervised play and character-molding opportunities. The Playground correlates with the rise of playground construction in urban areas throughout the United States. The boundary of the NRHP-eligible historic property is the current boundary of the park, which contains both historic and non-historic elements. The period of significance for Mother Waldron Playground spans from its construction date in 1937 until 1945, when supervised play ceased and Honolulu's Board of Parks and Recreation was formed.

This property is also eligible under Criterion C for its architectural and landscape design by Harry Sims Bent. The property displays a streamlined Art Moderne appearance with some Art Deco elements, a modern approach and a display of Harry Sims Bent's desire to create a pleasing environment for the park's users. The significant historic features of the original playground include the Art Deco/Art Moderne-style comfort station, remaining portion of the 'Ewa boundary wall, internal walls and benches, and the general layout of the makai portion of the playground, which constitutes the remaining portion of the recreational landscape that is still in its original configuration (Figure 32).

HART has completed the nomination for listing Mother Waldron Playground on the NRHP. The nomination was submitted to the SHPO on September 13, 2013, incorporating SHPO review comments and is included in Appendix D to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). During completion of the nomination, significant changes to Mother Waldron Playground were discovered, indicating that the playground retains limited integrity. The NRHP nomination notes that:

*In 1991-1992, the [Hawai'i Community Development Authority] changed the alignment of Halekauwila Street. This realignment of Halekauwila Street required a taking of approximately 12,700 square feet of Mother Waldron Playground on the playground's northeast end which reduced the park acreage by seventeen percent (17%). To reduce the impact of the playground's diminished size, the developed area southeast of Lana Lane was removed. Lana Lane, separating the playground from the developed area, was also removed. Mother Waldron Playground*

*was subsequently enlarged by approximately 54,000 square feet southeast. Although this 54,000 square foot area was officially designated for future use as part of Mother Waldron Playground, Coral Street's closure on the park's northwest side was never officially considered part of the park until the mid-1990s when improvements were made to the former Coral Street area.*

The entire mauka (Halekauwila Street) end of the park, adjacent to the Project, has been altered (Figure 32). The mauka end of the playground lost its basketball court, perimeter wall, and benches. Boundary walls were removed and subsequently reconstructed in a different location. A perimeter wall and benches nearly identical to the original were reconstructed along Halekauwila Street, but the wall now connects to the original low wall topped by terracotta tile that remains extant; the tile was not used on the replacement wall. There is no longer a convex curved entrance at the original playground's east corner as a result of the alterations.

Along Pohukaina Street, road widening associated with district improvements during the 1990s forced the perimeter wall and benches to be removed and reconstructed approximately 5 to 10 feet inside the playground's original boundary. In order to open Mother Waldron Playground to its newly acquired 54,000 square feet, a wall running along Lana Lane and intersecting with the rear of the comfort station was removed and never replaced. The original handball court was also removed and never replaced. The shape and size of the playground in the mauka portion of the park have been revised, and the configuration and equipment have been changed.

Mauka views include a playground configuration, playground equipment, and an apartment building that did not exist when the Playground was created. The original size and shape of the Playground have changed and the walls are reproductions that have been relocated. The view from the playground towards Halekauwila Street is not historically significant because Halekauwila Street itself was built on the original playground, and the 1990s apartment building across Halekauwila Street is not within the period of significance.

Mother Waldron Playground derives its historical significance from its historical development and use as a playground and its remaining architectural and landscape design features. The playground retains limited integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship. It includes features that were not built within the period of significance, including reconfigured play areas and moved, altered, and reconstructed walls as described above. The integrity of setting, feeling, and association has been highly compromised by surrounding development. The use of every surrounding parcel has changed since the playground was developed, diminishing the integrity of setting. The playground's setting was changed significantly when a roadway and an apartment building were constructed on part of the property and the park's boundaries were expanded.



**Figure 32. Significant Historic Features of Mother Waldron Playground**



#### **4.1.3 Proposed Changes to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park**

This section describes development projects and proposals, including a proposal to reconfigure Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park, that are proceeding independently of the Project. The various development projects are subject to individual federal and/or state environmental review.

HCDA's 2011 Mauka Area Plan (HCDA 2011) envisions substantial mixed-use redevelopment replacing the existing low-rise commercial and industrial uses surrounding the park (Figure 33). HCDA has identified the adjacent parcels 'Ewa of the park for a combination of mid- and high-rise development (Figure 34). The 18-story Halekauwila Place project began construction in early 2013, while the adjacent 690 Pohukaina is in the development process to construct the tallest building in Hawai'i (Figure 35).

On December 13, 2012, HCDA announced that it had selected Forrest City to develop the 690 Pohukaina project. The 690 Pohukaina project has not completed State of Hawai'i environmental or permitting review. In its offer, which represents a proposal and not an approved design, Forrest City stated that *"integrated planning and design result in an informed solution that achieves... support for existing transit systems and potential future solutions... and aggressive recreational programming of the adjacent Mother Waldron Park."* The offer, which was developed with full consideration of the Project, proposes to program Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park *"with uses for all ages; with play areas and a 'big wheel race track' for the very young, basketball courts and a skate park for teens and young adults, and a hula hālau, gracious walking paths, and ample canopy trees."*

Forrest City's proposal for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park (Figure 36) includes a complete restructuring of the park's recreational uses, eliminating its historic configuration. The comfort station and 'Ewa boundary wall would be the only retained original historic elements. The park would link Keawe Street and the development through a new "pedestrian plaza." The City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation, the entity with jurisdiction of the park, has not approved the proposed concept. The current recreational uses of the park would be changed or relocated within the park. For example, volleyball courts would be eliminated, a skate park and hula area would be introduced, and the basketball courts would be relocated within the park.



Source: Mauka Area Plan, HCDA, September 2011.

**Figure 33. Existing and Simulated Future Land Use adjacent to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park**



Source: HCDA 2011 public comment materials on 690 Pohukaina Project. Original graphic does not include a scale. North is at top of page.


**Figure 34. Site Plan for Proposed Development Adjacent to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park**





Source: HCDA 2012 public comment materials on 690 Pohukaina Project.

**Figure 35. Proposed 690 Pohukaina Street Project**



Source: Forrest City 2012, Best and Final Offer Mixed-use Transit-oriented Development Project at 690 Pohukaina Street

**Figure 36. Forrest City Proposed Site Plan for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park Programming**

## 4.2 Evaluation of Use of the Property

Section 1.2.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) explains the considerations included in the Section 4(f) evaluation.

### 4.2.1 Evaluation of Direct Use

The Project is located outside the boundary of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park (Figure 37). A 32-foot-wide elevated guideway will be constructed along Halekauwila Street (the mauka side of the park), carrying automated trains in each direction between 4 a.m. and midnight. The guideway will include an integrated parapet wall that will partially shield surrounding uses from the passing trains. Adjacent to the park, the guideway will be supported by straddle bents approximately every 150 feet along Halekauwila Street. The straddle bents consist of approximately 6-foot-by-6-foot columns placed behind a relocated sidewalk on each side of the street supporting a beam crossing above the travel lanes. There will be two columns adjacent to the mauka side of the park. The guideway will be centered over the street and carried atop the series of beams (Figure 38).






Figure 37. Detail of Honolulu Rail Transit Project in Relation to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park







**Figure 38. Existing View and Simulation of Elevated Guideway in Relation to the Mauka Boundary of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park**

The edge of the elevated guideway will be approximately 10 feet mauka of the park's edge and its height above the ground will be approximately 30 feet to the bottom and 40 feet to the top of the structure. The edge of the guideway will be located about 50 feet from the playground structure and about 290 feet from the volleyball court. The mauka-most roof edge of the park's Art Deco/Art Moderne-style comfort station is about 100 feet makai of the alignment.

The nearest transit station will be on Halekauwila Street between South Street and Keawe Street (Figure 28), approximately 450 feet 'Ewa of the park. The station will provide a new mode of access to the neighborhood, including park users.

There would be no direct use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. There will also not be any temporary occupancy of the park.

#### **4.2.2 Evaluation of Constructive Use**

This evaluation considers the potential for constructive use of the Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. A constructive use occurs when the proximity of a proposed project substantially impairs aesthetic features or attributes of a property protected by Section 4(f), where such features or attributes are considered important contributing elements to the value of the property. Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground is protected under Section 4(f) as both a public park and as a historic site. This analysis individually considers first the recreational activities followed by the historic features and attributes that qualify the Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground for Section 4(f) protection.

##### **Effect on Recreational Activities, Features, and Attributes**

The Project will not affect the park's design elements or aesthetic features that contribute to the park's use and enjoyment. The Project will not result in a constructive use as it relates to the recreational activities, features, and attributes for which the Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground is protected under Section 4(f) as described below.

##### **Noise**

The types of impacts that may qualify as constructive use, such as increased noise levels that would substantially interfere with the use of a noise sensitive feature are addressed in 23 CFR 774.15. For example, a constructive use would occur if the projected noise level increase substantially interferes with the use and enjoyment of an urban park where serenity and quiet are significant attributes.

Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground is not an urban park where serenity and quiet are significant attributes. As discussed in Section 4.1.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f), basketball, playground, picnicking, and volleyball are public recreational activities designated for Mother Waldron Neighborhood



Park and Playground and qualify the park for Section 4(f) protection. Parks used primarily for active recreation would not be considered noise-sensitive. However, some parks are used for passive recreation like reading, conversation, meditation and are treated as noise-sensitive (FTA 2006).

The FTA has determined that a constructive use does not occur when the projected operational noise levels of the Project do not exceed the noise impact criteria for a Section 4(f) activity in the FTA guidelines for transit noise and vibration impact assessment (USDOT 2012, FTA 2006).

Per the Final EIS/4(f) Figure 4-56, Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground is a Category 3 Land Use with an existing loudest-hour Leq of 58 dBA. Category 3 land uses include recreational facilities and certain historic sites and parks; therefore, the same noise criteria and assessment is applicable to both the recreational and historically significant aspects of the park. Per the FTA noise impact criteria shown in Figure 4-52 of the Final EIS/4(f), a noise impact will occur if the Project generates a noise exposure (the noise generated by the individual project, excluding other noise sources in the environment) of 62 dBA Leq(h) or greater. The Project incorporates sound-reducing features in its design, including a parapet wall along the edge of the guideway that reduces ground-level noise along the entire project length. The noise analysis for the Project found that the future project-generated noise exposure will be 56 dBA Leq(h) during the loudest hour and the Project will not create a noise impact (Table 15). The Leq noise level generated by the Project would be less than the existing environmental noise level at the park; therefore, the Project would have little effect on the cumulative future noise level in the park. The Project-generated noise would be less than the FTA noise impact criteria for a moderate impact.

**Table 15. Noise Data for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park**

Attribute	Value
Existing Noise Level	58 dBA Leq
Impact Criteria	62 dBA Leq(h)
Project-generated Noise Exposure	56 dBA Leq(h)
Cumulative Noise Level with Project	60 dBA Leq(h)

Source: Final EIS, Figure 4-56, RTD 2010.

Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park includes FTA Category 3 Land Use for noise impact analysis.

Per 23 CFR 774.15 [see Section 1.2.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)], constructive use does not occur when the projected operational noise levels of the Project do not exceed the noise impact criteria for a Section 4(f) activity in the FTA guidelines for transit noise and vibration impact assessment. Accordingly, the Project will not have a constructive use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground related to noise.

### ***Vibration Impact***

Per Section 4.10.3 of the Final EIS/4(f), no operational vibration level within the project corridor will exceed the protective FTA criterion of 72 VdB for locations where people sleep. Construction vibration was addressed in Section 4.18.5 of the Final EIS/4(f). Only pile driving occurring within 75 feet of sensitive structures was identified to potentially cause vibration damage. No pile driving will occur near Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. Accordingly, the Project will not have a constructive use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground related to vibration.

### ***Access***

The Project will not affect access to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. Any temporary restriction of access during construction will be limited to the mauka boundary of the park, and access through the other edges of the park will still be possible. The Project will provide an additional mode of access to the park and, in the long term, will improve park access. Accordingly, the Project will not have a constructive use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground related to access.

### ***Aesthetic Qualities of the Park***

The City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation, the agency with authority over Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park, identified active and passive recreation, including basketball, playground, picnicking, and volleyball, as significant activities, features, or attributes of the park. These activities are not highly sensitive to visual setting. Public recreational uses are the park's activities and attributes that qualify it for protection as a recreational resource under Section 4(f). The Project will not affect the park's design elements or features that contribute to the park's use and enjoyment. Therefore, there will be no constructive use related to recreational use.

The existing visual setting is typical of an urban park environment. Even in the absence of the Project, the setting will continue to be urban, with high-rise residential buildings currently being developed adjacent to the 'Ewa boundary of the park (Figure 34). The park does not provide an unspoiled natural setting or provide significant views or vistas (Figure 30).

The elevated guideway will dominate mauka views from the mauka edge of the park (Figure 39). It will be visible, but of similar scale as surrounding buildings, from areas of the park with greater use (Figure 40). Current views are of mid- and high-rise residential and commercial buildings mauka of the park. Views of the Ko'olau Mountains are largely blocked by existing development (Figure 30 and Figure 40), and the guideway will have little additional effect on distant views.



***Figure 39. Existing View and Simulation Near Elevated Guideway from within Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park***





**Figure 40. Existing View and Simulation Showing Elevated Guideway from Area of Frequent Use within Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park**



Introduction of the elevated guideway immediately beyond the mauka boundary of the park will not introduce an inconsistent visual element that will substantially diminish the use of the park related to any of the activities, features, and attributes identified in Section 4.1.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) as significant to the park.

The change in views will not substantially impair use of the park for basketball, playground activities, picnicking, or volleyball. The guideway will shade the very mauka edge of the park during morning hours throughout the year and extending into early afternoon around the summer solstice. The affected area will be small. Most park users are seeking shade, making this effect a minor benefit to park users. The park will continue to serve future users providing the same activities, features, and attributes available today without substantial impairment.

### ***Comparison to Moanalua Community Park***

The City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) noted that Moanalua Community Park (Figure 41) is immediately adjacent to the elevated Pu'uloa Road interchange with Moanalua Freeway (DPR 2013). The interchange ramp is larger, closer to recreational uses, and generates more noise than the rail guideway will generate at Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park. DPR staff observed that the area under and immediately adjacent to the elevated ramp, which includes basketball and tennis courts and a children's playground, is well used and benefits from the shade and weather protection provided by the elevated roadway. A field survey was conducted over a period of seven days to confirm the DPR's observations (Table 16). During one rainy day, all park users were under the elevated roadway structure. Traffic noise levels were measured at 61 dBA Leq at Moanalua Community Park, which is 5 dBA louder than the projected project-generated level at Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park (Table 15).

Overall, the proximity of the elevated ramp did not substantially diminish the use of Moanalua Community Park, or shift users to parts of the park further from the structure. The types of recreational uses that occur at Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park also occur at Moanalua Community Park with no observed effect from the elevated roadway. These observations further indicate that the presence of an elevated guideway will have no detrimental effects on the recreational use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park.



**Figure 41. Moanalua Community Park**

**Table 16. Observed Use of Moanalua Community Park**

Distance from Elevated Structure	Number of Park Users Observed
0 to 30 feet	56
30 to 60 feet	15
60 to 90 feet	10
More than 90 feet	18

### **Effect on Historic Features**

During the Section 106 historic review process, the FTA determined the eligibility of properties for listing on the NRHP and the effect of the Project on historic properties located within the Area of Potential Effects. In consultation with the SHPO, the FTA determined that the Project will have an adverse effect on Mother Waldron Playground. The District Court noted in its November 1, 2012 Summary Judgment Order that the Historic Effects Report observed that the Project's adverse effect will be to the park's setting. The Historic Effects Report states:

*Mother Waldron Playground is primarily an outdoor designed space, although it does contain a comfort station. Generally, the effects on building settings are different than those on a resource*

*that is primarily an outdoor facility. While these recently constructed adjacent buildings detract from the playground's overall historic setting, the surrounding buildings are separated from the playground by the streets that encircle the playground. Because the guideway would introduce a new element into Mother Waldron Playground's setting in a close proximity, an effect that is particularly apparent to an outdoor resource, there would be an adverse effect. No audible or atmospheric effects to this property were identified.*

The SHPO concurred with this effect determination; measures to mitigate the effect were included in the PA, which was executed between the FTA, the SHPO, the Navy, HART and the ACHP on January 18, 2011. Attachment 2 to the PA summarized the final effect determination for each property that will be adversely affected by the Project. The text for Mother Waldron Playground states:

*There is no direct impact to the property. The Project will be about 10 feet mauka of the park's edge, 150 feet mauka of the Art Deco/ Art Moderne-style comfort station and elevated about 35 to 40 feet high in this location. The Project will not affect the park's design elements or aesthetic features that contribute to the park's use and enjoyment. However, there will be an effect to setting.*

As described in Section 4.1.2, the integrity of setting, feeling, and association has been highly compromised by surrounding development. Mauka views include a playground configuration, playground equipment, and an apartment building that did not exist when the Playground was created. The original size and shape of the Playground has changed, the walls are reproductions that have been relocated, and the view of the 1990s building across Halekauwila Street is not historically significant. As a result, the primary view towards the Project does not currently have historical and aesthetic integrity based on the Playground's era of historical significance. The guideway would introduce a new element into Mother Waldron Playground's setting in a close proximity. The Project will not substantially impair this view. The visual intrusion does not reach the threshold of substantial impairment of the attributes which cause the playground to be eligible for the NRHP as it would still retain its historic attributes and features as discussed below.

Public views into the Playground from the mauka side already must look past the 1990s redesign of the Playground, and modern playground equipment, to see the original comfort station and other remnants of the original design. The proximity of the Project to the mauka playground boundary will not substantially impair the aesthetics or views of historical or design features that qualify the Playground for protection under Section 4(f). The only remaining unaltered views of historical or design features that qualify the Playground for protection under Section 4(f) are from within the park and would not be affected by the Project.

Mother Waldron Playground is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the national playground movement and under Criterion C for its Art Moderne and Art Deco architectural and landscape design by Harry Sims Bent. These architectural and landscape design features include the Art Deco/Art Moderne-style comfort station, the remaining portion of the 'Ewa boundary wall, internal walls and benches, and the general layout of the makai portion of the playground, which constitutes the remaining portion of the recreational landscape that is still in its original configuration.

Construction of a new guideway within the immediate viewshed of the historic property resulted in an adverse effect finding under Section 106 for the diminishment of the setting. However, this visual intrusion does not reach the threshold of substantial impairment of the attributes which cause the playground to be eligible for the NRHP as it would still retain its historic attributes and features.

The Playground's association with the national playground movement (Criterion A) will be unaffected by the Project's proximity to the mauka playground boundary. The Project would not affect the Art Deco/Art Moderne-style comfort station, the remaining portion of the 'Ewa boundary wall, internal walls and benches, and the general layout of the makai portion of the playground. The Project would not affect the features, attributes or design for which the property is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. As a result, there will be no constructive use of the historic activities, features, and attributes of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground.

### **Effect on Views from Residences Outside the Park**

The District Court in its November 1, 2012, Summary Judgment Order noted a comment in the record stating that "there would be 'devastating' impacts on seaward views of and over the park from the apartment buildings inland of the guideway." While this is a significant visual impact under NEPA that was disclosed in the Final EIS/4(f) (Final EIS/4(f), Page 4-100), it is not a Section 4(f) use. Impacts that are sufficient to cause an impact under NEPA may not constitute a constructive use under Section 4(f). The Section 4(f) regulations limit constructive use to circumstances where a "project's proximity impacts are so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired." [23 CFR 774.15(a)] Thus, constructive use could only occur if views of and over the park from adjacent apartment buildings were a protected activity, feature, or attribute of the park.

The views of the park from private residences mauka of the park are not among the significant activities, features, and attributes of the park that qualify it for protection under Section 4(f) because setting was not the basis for listing the park, either for recreation use or as an historic site. In fact, the apartments contributed directly to the alteration of the park's setting and to the fact that the mauka portion of the park is not a contributing feature. When Halekauwila Street



was expanded, the street expansion and the apartment buildings were constructed on part of the playground, and the remaining uses and features were altered, moved, and rebuilt.

### **Summary of Constructive Use Evaluation**

The Project will not result in a constructive use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. The Project will not create proximity impacts so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. As a result, there will be no constructive use of the significant recreational and historic activities, features, and attributes of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground.

#### **4.2.3 Coordination with Agency with Jurisdiction**

The SHPO concurred with the effect determination for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground in 2011. Measures to mitigate the effect were included in the PA, which was executed between the FTA, the SHPO, the Navy, HART and the ACHP on January 18, 2011.

HART met with the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation on two instances (DPR 2012, DPR 2013) and provided a draft of the evaluation of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground for their review. They concurred with the content and findings of the analysis for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park on May 22, 2013 [Appendix D to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)].

The Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) was sent to the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation on May 31, 2013. In its letter, dated July 10, 2013, the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation supported the conclusions that the Project, as planned, will not use Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park (See Appendix A).

The SHPO and ACHP were also sent copies of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) for review and comment on May 31, 2013. As noted in the State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources letter, dated July 22, 2013, the SHPO did not comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). The ACHP also did not comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f).

### **4.3 Alternatives to an Alignment Near Mother Waldron Playground**

Under 23 CFR 774.3(a)(1), an evaluation of feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives is required if the alternative results in a use of any Section 4(f) resource. Despite the conclusion that the Project will not have a constructive use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground, the FTA and the City


evaluated whether there are any alternatives that would avoid the impacts to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park. As described below, the identified alternative involving a shift of the alignment to Queen Street would not avoid impacts on other Section 4(f) properties. Other identified alternatives would have similar impacts on Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park.

Alternatives makai of the park were rejected because a shift to Pohukaina Street would still border the park and a shift to Auahi Street would not be able to transition back to the terminal station at Ala Moana Center as a result of recent development of the Ward Village Shops. Reaching Ala Moana Center is necessary to serve bus transfer demand at the existing Ala Moana Center transit center. An alignment further mauka was considered along Queen Street (Figure 42).

Queen Street has a narrow 60-foot right-of-way between Coral Street and Ward Avenue, which would have to be widened to accommodate the elevated guideway. As a result, the Queen Street Shift Alternative would require full or partial property acquisition from 39 parcels, including three properties that were determined during the Alternatives Analysis to be potentially historic: Kewalo Theatre, American Savings Bank Queen Street and Ward Avenue Branch, and Island Roses. Two of the three properties, Kewalo Theatre and Island Roses, have minimum setbacks from the property line and widening of Queen Street to accommodate the guideway would require their demolition. The acquisition would result in use of these potentially-historic properties. The current uses of 28 of these parcels would be displaced. This compares to displacements on five parcels in this area of the Project. The Queen Street Shift Alternative would increase the cost of the project by approximately \$70 million in 2009 dollars. Relocation of the Civic Center and Kaka'ako Stations would have a minor effect on ridership.

## **4.4 Summary of Use**

The Project will not result in a direct use or temporary occupancy of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. The Project will not substantially impair the historic or recreational activities, features, and attributes that qualify for protection under Section 4(f). As a result, there will be no constructive use of the significant recreational and historic activities, features, and attributes of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. The Project will not have a Section 4(f) use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground.







FTA and HART have coordinated with the agencies with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) resources that are evaluated in this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). FTA and HART issued the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) for public review and comment on May 31, 2013, and a notice of availability appeared in the *Federal Register* on June 7, 2013. HART held a public and agency Supplemental EIS/4(f) hearing on July 9, 2013, and the comment period ended on July 22, 2013.

## **5.1 Agency Consultation**

Prior to issuing the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), HART met with the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation on two instances (DPR 2012, DPR 2013) and provided a draft of the evaluation of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground for their review. They concurred with the content and findings of the analysis for Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park on May 22, 2013 [Appendix D to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. The information provided by the Department of Parks and Recreation is included in Sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.3 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). In its letter, dated July 10, 2013, the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation supported the conclusions of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) that the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is not a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative, that the Project has the least overall harm to Section 4(f) properties, and the Project, as planned, will not use Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park (See Appendix A).

The SHPO accepted the results of the final archaeological inventory surveys for construction phase 4 of the Project on August 26, 2013. The SHPO concurred on August 26, 2013 that archaeological sites in Phase 4 of the Project (City Center) that FTA determined eligible for listing on the NRHP are eligible only under Criterion D [Appendix D to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)].

FTA and HART submitted the NRHP nomination for listing Mother Waldron Playground on the NRHP to the SHPO on September 13, 2013, incorporating SHPO review comments on the draft nomination, which were dated April 23, 2013 and received on July 3, 2013 [Appendix D to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. The SHPO previously concurred with adverse effect determinations for the Project. The ACHP participated in the resolution of effects and signed the PA, including the determination for Mother Waldron Playground that stated [Attachment 2 to the PA (FTA 2011)]:

*There is no direct impact to the property. The Project will be about 10 feet mauka of the park's edge, 150 feet mauka of the Art Deco/Art Moderne-style comfort station and elevated about 35 to 40 feet high in this location. The Project will not affect the park's design*

*elements or aesthetic features that contribute to the park's use and enjoyment. However, there will be an effect to setting.*

The SHPO and ACHP were sent copies of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) for review and comment on May 31, 2013. As noted in the State of Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources letter, dated July 22, 2013, the SHPO did not comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). The ACHP also did not comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). The letter from State of Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources is included in Appendix A.

The U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) provided comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) on July 22, 2013. FTA and HART continued coordination with the DOI in a teleconference on August 27, 2013. The responses to comments submitted by DOI in Appendix A reflect the content of the discussion.

## **5.2 Public and Agency Comments on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f)**

Eighty-seven comment submissions were received on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), including 17 submissions from agencies, four from groups and organizations, 59 from businesses and individuals, and public testimony from seven individuals. All together, the submissions included 211 individual comments. Appendix A to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) contains copies of all submissions received along with responses to all substantive comments pertaining to the scope of the Supplemental EIS/4(f).

Comments were received on a range of topics. A number of comments received were related to the costs and benefits of extending the Project to UH Mānoa compared to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. Several comments were received regarding the application of feasibility and prudence criteria. Several commenters stated that the Supplemental EIS/4(f) fails to address TCPs. Other comments were outside the scope of the Supplemental EIS/4(f) or were previously addressed in the Final EIS/4(f) or ROD (RTD 2010, FTA 2011a). Common comments are summarized below and addressed in the following sections. Responses to individual comments are provided in Appendix A of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f).

### **5.2.1 Summary of Comments Related to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative**

A number of agencies and individuals provided additional information about possible underground conflicts with the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, including sub-surface parking access and utilities. Information was added in Section 3.5.3 related to karst formations that would be affected by the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

Several comments proposed cost-saving measures relating to shortening the alternative in one or more ways. This issue is addressed in Section 5.2.4 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). Questions concerning how well the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative served the study corridor compared to the Project were addressed with information presented in Section 3.5.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f).

Comments on the findings of the least overall harm analysis for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative were responded to with information from Section 3.7 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f).

Comments also requested additional analysis on the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, including analysis on historic properties and traffic impacts. None of the analyses requested changing the finding that the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is not prudent.

### ***5.2.2 Summary of Comments Related to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground***

The most common comments regarding Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park were related to plans for the park and other development plans in the vicinity of the Park. This development is occurring independently of the Project and does not affect the conclusion that the Project will not constructively use Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground.

Other comments addressed avoidance of impacts to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground, as considered in the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). Because there would be no use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground, the evaluation of avoidance alternatives is not required. Nonetheless, an alternative alignment on Queen Street was analyzed to provide information on potential options to reduce impacts on Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. The Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) concluded that options for avoiding impacts to Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground would have more impacts on historic properties. Comments on alternatives to avoid impacts to the park are addressed in the responses to comments.

### ***5.2.3 Summary of Revisions to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) in Response to Comments***

This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) was revised in the following locations in response to comments and information received during the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) comment period.

- Section 1.1 was updated to reflect the conclusion of the traditional cultural properties evaluation.

- Section 1.3 was updated to reflect the status of the Supplemental EIS/4(f) process.
- Section 3.1 was expanded to provide more detail about the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.
- Section 3.3.1 was expanded with additional information about the OR&L parcel and A'ala Park that was provided by the agencies with jurisdiction over those resources and to correct the NRHP-eligibility status of the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building.
- Section 3.5.3 was updated to clarify the eligibility status of historic properties, with information on the completion of Archaeological Inventory Surveys and with additional information on utility and access conflicts, karst formations, and potential contaminated soils that could be encountered during the construction of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.
- Section 3.7 was expanded to provide more detail on the identification of the alternative with the least overall harm.
- Sections 4.1.2 and 4.2.2 were updated to reflect SHPO coordination and review of the NRHP nomination for Mother Waldron Playground and to clarify the Section 4(f) consideration of significant historic features.
- Section 5 was updated and expanded to reflect outreach and coordination completed on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) process.

#### **5.2.4 Common Comments and Responses**

Appendix A to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) contains copies of all submissions received along with responses to all substantive comments pertaining to the scope of the Supplemental EIS/4(f). When comments raise issues that were addressed by the Final EIS/4(f), the responses refer to the relevant text in the Final EIS/4(f). When comments raise issues that were addressed by the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), the responses refer to the relevant text in the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). If a change has been made to the text of the Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) in response to a comment, the response refers to the relevant text in this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). This section provides responses to the most common comments, as summarized below.

**Common Comment 1:** Several commenters observed that the Project and the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative are not equal in length. They suggested that the Supplemental EIS/4(f) should examine a shortened Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative that ends before UH Mānoa, which would make this alternative more similar in length to the Project and would reduce the cost of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

**Common Response 1:** The scope of this Supplemental EIS/4(f) is limited to the evaluation and findings under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act related to whether the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is a feasible and



prudent avoidance alternative per the District Court's Summary Judgment Order. The Summary Judgment Order did not require an examination of additional alternatives.

As described in Section 3.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f), the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative was designed to extend to UH Mānoa to provide transit service in the study corridor which is comparable to that of the Project. Shortening the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative to stop before UH Mānoa would substantially degrade rail transit service because it would require a bus transfer to both Ala Moana Center and UH Mānoa, the two major activity centers near the Koko Head end of the study corridor.

To evaluate the effect of shortening the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative, capital costs and the effects on the transportation system were calculated for an option that would end at the Alapai Transit Center. This location would provide the opportunity for bus transfer to both Ala Moana Center and UH Mānoa. The shortened Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would have a capital cost of \$5,600 million (YOE), or \$480 million (YOE) greater than the Project (Table 17). The data in Table 18 shows that the shortened alternative would not meet the Purpose and Need, having 16 percent fewer rail boardings and a 20 percent reduction in transit user benefits relative to the Project. The data in Table 17 shows that even a shortened alternative, which would have a capital cost nine percent greater than the Project, would be beyond HART's funding capacity.

**Table 17. Capital Costs Excluding Finance Charges for Additional Options**

Capital Costs	The Project	Beretania Street Tunnel	Difference from the Project	Beretania Street Tunnel ending at Alapai	Difference from the Project	The Project Extended to UH Mānoa	Difference from the Project
2006 \$M	4,190	4,840	650	4,470	280	4,740	550
2009 \$M	4,280	5,030	750	4,640	360	4,920	640
YOE \$M	5,120	6,080	960	5,600	480	5,940	820

Note: Values for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative ending at Alapai and the extension of the Project to UH Mānoa were calculated using the same methodology and assumptions used to calculate the costs for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative included in Table 9 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). All costs are rounded to the nearest 10 million.

Because a shortened alternative would not reach the major activity centers near the Koko Head end of the study corridor and, as a result, would not achieve the desired level of transit user benefits, it would not meet the Purpose and Need as specified in Section 1.4 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). Additionally, the shortened Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would not end at a major activity center. Because the end point would not meet FTA's regulatory requirements that alternatives evaluated must connect logical termini, it would not be carried forward for further environmental analysis under 23 CFR 771.111(f)(1).

In addition to these capital costs, interest and finance charges would apply to both the Project and the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. The Final EIS/4(f)

documented that interest and finance charges would total \$398 million (YOE) for the Project. These charges would be greater for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative because additional borrowing would be required to pay for the higher capital cost and longer construction duration of this tunnel alternative.

**Table 18. Consideration of Effectiveness of Shortening the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative**

Attribute	Alternative (2030)			
	Beretania Street Tunnel	Beretania Street Tunnel ending at Alapai	The Project	The Project with Future Extension to UH Mānoa
<b>Transit Travel Time (minutes)</b>				
Waiʻanae to UH Mānoa	84 minutes	99 minutes	93 minutes	86 minutes
Kapolei to Ala Moana Center	71 minutes	70 minutes	59 minutes	59 minutes
<b>Transit Performance</b>				
Daily rail boardings	120,700	98,080	116,300	132,700
Daily total transit trips	284,400	271,805	282,500	290,800
Transit user benefits (hours per year)	20,435,000	16,619,251	20,775,000	23,301,000
<b>Highway Performance</b>				
Daily islandwide vehicle miles traveled	13,065,000	13,149,000	13,049,000	13,019,000
Daily islandwide vehicle hours traveled	384,100	388,700	383,800	381,800
Daily islandwide vehicle hours of delay	85,700	88,400	85,800	84,500

This information documents that the cost of the shortened Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative ending at the Alapai Transit Center is not within the available funds for the Project. As documented in the Final EIS/4(f), \$5,544 million (YOE) is the total of anticipated available funds from all sources to construct the Project [Table 6-4 of the Final EIS/4(f)]. FTA and HART have entered into a Full Funding Grant Agreement that limits the federal participation to \$1,550 million. No additional federal funding is available to pay for the additional cost of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. Therefore, state and local funding would have to be allocated to meet the funding gap for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. Any additional state or local funds would have to be transferred from other programs, such as bus operations or public safety. As a result of decreased total state tax revenue, which decreased from \$5.1 billion in 2007 to \$4.7 billion in 2009, before partially recovering to \$4.9 billion in 2011 (DBEDT 2011, 2013), many of those programs have already experienced budget cuts in recent years. In addition to the environmental impacts described in the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), the inability to fund other projects and programs would have environmental and community effects that contribute to the imprudence of the alternative.

The shortened Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative ending at the Alapai Transit Center would result in a substantial reduction in ridership (18,000 fewer daily rail boardings) and increase in cost compared to the Project [\$480 million (YOE)].

**Common Comment 2:** Several commenters observed that the Project and the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative are not equal in length and suggested that the Supplemental EIS/4(f) should examine the extension of the Project to UH Mānoa in comparison to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

**Common Response 2:** The scope of this Supplemental EIS/4(f) is limited to the evaluation and findings under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act related to whether the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative per the District Court's Summary Judgment Order. The Summary Judgment Order did not require an examination of additional alternatives.

The Final EIS/4(f) documented \$5,120 million (YOE) in capital costs for the Project, which is reflected in Table 9 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). The capital cost to extend the Project from Ala Moana Center to UH Mānoa have been calculated and included in Table 17. Extension from Ala Moana Center to UH Mānoa would add \$820 million (YOE) to the cost of the Project. The capital costs (alone) for the Project and the extension to UH Mānoa would be \$5,940 million (YOE) compared to the total capital costs of \$ 6,080 million (YOE) for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative (Table 17). The cost of the Project plus the additional cost of the extension to UH Mānoa, if it were included at the time of Project construction, is lower than the cost of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

In addition to these capital costs, interest and finance charges would apply. The Final EIS/4(f) documented that interest and finance charges would total \$398 million (YOE) for the Project. These charges would be greater for the Project including the extension to UH Mānoa because additional borrowing would be required to pay for the higher capital cost of the alternative.

As documented in the Final EIS/4(f), \$5,544 million (YOE) is the total of anticipated available funds from all sources to construct the Project [Table 6-4 of the Final EIS/4(f)]. FTA and HART have entered into a Full Funding Grant Agreement that limits the federal participation to \$1,550 million. No additional federal funding is available to pay for the additional cost of extending the approved Project to UH Mānoa nor is additional funding available for the greater additional cost of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. Therefore, state and local funding would have to be allocated to meet the funding gap for either the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative or the extension to UH Mānoa. Any additional state or local funds would have to be transferred from other programs, such as bus operations or public safety. As a result of decreased total state tax revenue, which decreased from \$5.1 billion in 2007 to \$4.7 billion in 2009 before partially

recovering to \$4.9 billion in 2011 (DBEDT 2011, 2013), many State and Local programs have already experienced budget cuts in recent years.

As indicated in Table 3 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), should the potential extension to UH Mānoa be built, there would be substantial additional benefits to transit users, including a 10-percent increase in rail boardings (12,000 additional daily boardings) compared to the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. While there would be an overall cost savings if an extension to UH Mānoa were built at the same time as the Project, as compared to a future date, there is no available funding to construct the extension to UH Mānoa. Section 2.5.10 of the Final EIS/4(f) describes the extensions as illustrative projects in the O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan, which are projects that are desired prior to 2030, but for which no funding source has been identified. Comments on the extension to UH Mānoa were addressed in Section 8.6.2 of the Final EIS/4(f).

**Common Comment 3:** Several commenters suggested that the 'Ewa end of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative should be shortened to reduce the cost of the alternative.

**Common Response 3:** The scope of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) is limited to the evaluation and findings under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act related to whether the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative per the District Court's Summary Judgment Order. The Summary Judgment Order did not require an examination of additional alternatives.

As documented in Figure 3-10 of the Final EIS/4(f), 23,680 daily boardings (20 percent of all rail boardings) are projected at stations that would be eliminated by shortening the system to Leeward Community College.

Section 3.5.4 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) identified the cost savings from an option to shorten the 'Ewa end of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. Shortening the system to end at the Leeward Community College Station, which is adjacent to the maintenance and storage site, would reduce project capital costs by approximately \$580 million in 2009 dollars.

Based on the above estimate, shortening to the vicinity of Fort Weaver Road [Figure 1 in this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)] would reduce the cost of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative by less than \$300 million (2009 dollars). The deferral of construction of the 'Ewa end of the Project to a location somewhere between Leeward Community College and Fort Weaver Road would reduce project capital costs by between \$300 and \$580 million in 2009 dollars. The capital cost of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative shortened at the 'Ewa end would be between \$170 and \$450 million (2009 dollars) greater than the capital cost of the Project.



The savings from shortening the 'Ewa end of the system, whether to end at Leeward Community college, Fort Weaver Road, or a location in between, would not close the funding gap between the cost of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative and the total available funds for the Honolulu Rail Transit Project as discussed in Section 3.5.4 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). Because of the substantial reduction in ridership and the limited cost savings of the option, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative shortened at the 'Ewa end would not be a reasonable transportation investment compared to the Project. In addition, eliminating the 'Ewa portion of the Project would not accomplish the Project's purpose of focusing development in the 'Ewa area.

**Common Comment 4:** Several commenters stated that the Supplemental EIS/4(f) fails to address traditional cultural properties (TCPs), including various wahi pana (storied and sacred places).

**Common Response 4:** As discussed in Section 1.1 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f), the November 1, 2012 Summary Judgment Order required the City and FTA to complete the identification of TCPs and, for any newly identified TCPs, required the City and FTA to complete a Section 4(f) analysis. The Summary Judgment Order required the Final EIS/4(f) to be supplemented with regard to impacts on newly identified TCPs to the extent that this process requires changes that "may result in significant environmental impacts 'in a manner not previously evaluated and considered'" (Summary Judgment Order, page 13). The additional TCP studies have not identified any significant environmental impacts not previously evaluated.

FTA and the City have conducted extensive research and consultation to identify TCPs within the Project's area of potential effect and determination if the TCPs were NRHP-eligible as specified in Stipulation II.A of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) among FTA, the City, the U.S. Navy, the SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. As required by 40 CFR 1502.9, if through this process, the City and FTA identified new potentially significant impacts caused by the Project, a supplemental analysis would have been prepared. Only TCPs that are NRHP-eligible would be Section 4(f) properties.

As described in the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), the City and FTA previously completed studies on the first three phases of the Project and determined that no NRHP-eligible TCPs would be adversely affected by the Project. The SHPO concurred with the determination of eligibility and effect. Therefore, the City and FTA also determined that there would be no Section 4(f) use.

After the publication of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), the City and FTA completed the study for Section 4 of the Project and determined that there are no TCPs within the area of potential effect (APE) for HRTS Section 4 that are eligible for the NRHP. Therefore, the Section 4 of Project will not adversely affect any additional TCPs that are eligible for the NRHP. On August 29, 2013, FTA submitted the determination of eligibility and finding of effect that the Project

would not affect any additional TCPs to the SHPO. After additional coordination, the SHPO concurred with the determination on September 27, 2013 [Appendix D to this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f)]. Since there are no additional TCPs eligible for the NRHP in Section 4, the City and FTA also determined that there would not be a Section 4(f) use of NRHP-eligible TCPs. This Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) has been updated accordingly.

Because City and FTA did not identify any effects on NRHP-eligible TCPs, there is no need to prepare an additional supplement to the Final EIS/4(f).

**Common Comment 5:** Several commenters supported the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative because they believed that it would be a prudent and feasible avoidance alternative to the use of Section 4(f) properties by the Project. Commenters also supported the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative because they believed it would avoid other impacts, better serve transit users, and have lower implementation costs among other reasons.

**Common Response 5:** As explained in Section 1.2.2 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) and defined in 23 CFR 774.17(1), a “feasible and prudent avoidance alternative must avoid the use of Section 4(f) resources. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would directly use four Section 4(f) properties. Thus, the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is not a Section 4(f) avoidance alternative. As described in Section 3.3.5 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would use the OR&L Office/Document Storage Building and Terminal Building, former filling station on OR&L parcel, McKinley High School, and King Florist Building. The use is detailed in Table 11 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) as direct use of four Section 4(f) properties, including demolition, removal, relocation, or alteration of three historic properties.

Although the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is not an avoidance alternative, analysis of whether the alternative is feasible and prudent has been completed for the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative in light of the District Court’s requirement to “fully consider the prudence and feasibility of the Beretania tunnel alternative specifically, and supplement the FEIS[4(f)] and ROD to reflect this reasoned analysis in light of evidence regarding costs, consistency with the Project’s purpose, and other pertinent factors”. Feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives are defined in 23 CFR 771.17(1) and further explained in Section 1.2.2 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). Section 3.5 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) identified and discussed the definition for “feasible” and the six tests for “prudence” established in the FHWA/FTA Section 4(f) regulations. The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative is feasible to construct the alternative as a matter of engineering, but it is not a prudent alternative because of its extraordinary cost, and other factors such as environmental impacts and long-term construction impacts [23 CFR 774.17(1)(vi)].

Section 3.5.6 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) (Cumulative Consideration of Factors), concluded that “[c]umulatively, the [adverse] environmental effects and

extraordinary increase in the cost” make the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative imprudent. Environmental effects are discussed in Section 3.5.3, and the extraordinary increase in cost is discussed in Section 3.5.4. These factors are summarized in Section 3.6 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) with the following language:

*The Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would not be a feasible and prudent avoidance alternative because it would use other Section 4(f) properties. It is feasible to construct the alternative as a matter of engineering, but it is not a prudent alternative because of its extraordinary cost and other factors such as environmental impacts and long-term construction impacts. The impacts on parks and historic properties; settlement risks from tunnel construction; environmental effects related to visual, historic architecture, and traffic and business access disruption during construction; and delayed benefits from this alternative would contribute to the imprudence of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative. The overall extraordinary increase in the cost of the alternative alone would make the alternative imprudent.*

**Common Comment 6:** Several commenters stated that they believed that the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative would have least overall harm when compared to the Project.

**Common Response 6:** As explained in Section 1.2.3 and stated at the beginning of Section 3.7 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), in a situation where no alternatives are identified as feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives, the Section 4(f) regulations [23 CFR 774.3(c)] require an analysis of which alternative would cause “least overall harm” to resources protected by Section 4(f). Because the regulations would require an “overall least harm” assessment, one is also included in this document to ensure compliance with the law.

Per 23 CFR 774.7(c), the consideration of impacts includes both objective, quantifiable impacts and qualitative measures that provide a more subjective assessment of harm. The least overall harm analysis quantitatively and qualitatively considers all of the factors set forth in 23 CFR 774.3(c)(1), as described in Section 1.2.3 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). The analysis was described in Section 3.7 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) and additional detail has been added to Section 3.7 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). The City and FTA concluded that the Project would have the least overall harm in light of Section 4(f)’s preservation purpose. This conclusion is summarized in Table 12 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f).

**Common Comment 7:** Several commenters stated that the Project would impact or use Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground.

**Common Response 7:** As described in Section 4.2 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), the Project would be located entirely outside the boundary of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and therefore would not directly use the Section 4(f) resource. The Project also will not result in a constructive use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. The significant historic features or recreational activities, features, and attributes that qualify for protection under Section 4(f) were described in Section 4.1 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f). Based on comments, the text in Section 4.2.2 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) has been further clarified to detail that the Project will not create proximity impacts so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. As a result, there will be no constructive use of the significant recreational and historic activities, features, and attributes of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. There will be neither direct use nor temporary occupancy of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground. The Project will not have a Section 4(f) use of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground.

**Common Comment 8:** Several commenters observed that other development in the vicinity of Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park and Playground would affect the park. Some of the commenters also suggested that the other development was related to the Project.

**Common Response 8:** The Final EIS/4(f) identified Mother Waldron Playground as a Section 4(f) resource both as a public park and as an NRHP-eligible historic property. Section 4.1.3 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) described the changes proposed for the area surrounding Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park. In accordance with HCDA's 2011 Mauka Area Plan, the 18-story Halekauwila Place project began construction in early 2013, while the adjacent 690 Pohukaina is in the development process to construct the tallest building in Hawai'i. These development projects and proposals, including a proposal (which has not been approved) to reconfigure Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park would likely affect the park, but these effects are not direct or indirect effects of the Project and are proceeding independently of the Project. The effects of such development projects were addressed in the Cumulative Effects section (Section 4.19.3) of the Final EIS/4(f). The cumulative effects of the Project on historic properties were considered in the Programmatic Agreement, which was executed between the FTA, the SHPO, the Navy, HART, and the ACHP on January 18, 2011.

Section 4.1.3 in the Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) clarifies that these development projects and proposals, including a proposal to reconfigure Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park, are proceeding independently of the Project. The various development projects are subject to individual federal and/or state environmental review. The 690 Pohukaina project has not completed State of Hawai'i environmental or permitting review.



**Common Comment 9:** Several commenters requested clarification of the methods used to evaluate the eligibility and/or the effect on Section 4(f) resources that qualify for protection because they are historic sites along the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

**Common Response 9:** To meet the purposes of the Section 4(f) analysis required by the Summary Judgment Order, the City and FTA identified historic sites that would qualify for Section 4(f) protection using information collected from the Alternatives Analysis process and the methods and assumptions used to make determinations of eligibility and determinations of effect under the Section 106 process for the Project.

As described in Section 3.5.3, during the Alternatives Analysis process, the City used qualified architectural historians to identify historic properties that may qualify for listing on the NRHP based on literature review, records searches, age (built before 1967) and a preliminary review of integrity to evaluate alternatives, consistent with Appendix A to 23 CFR 450, *Linking the Transportation Planning and NEPA Processes*. The identification of historic properties for this Section 4(f) analysis was drawn from sites listed on the NRHP; information from the Alternatives Analysis, and information on the Section 106 analysis, including NRHP-eligibility criteria, included in Section 4.16.1 of the Final EIS/4(f). The sites that were evaluated as potentially eligible for the NRHP for this analysis were identified by qualified architectural historians based on age and review of integrity during the Alternatives Analysis for purposes of screening analysis (DTS 2006) using the same process and assumptions detailed for the Project in the Final EIS/4(f). The same approach to historic property boundaries as used in the evaluation of the Project documented in Section 4.16.3 of the Final EIS/4(f) was applied to the properties along the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

The City and FTA evaluated the same types of visual, atmospheric, and audible impacts that were assessed for the Project. This analysis was prepared in response to the Summary Judgment Order, particularly in consideration of whether there are “severe social, economic, or environmental impacts” under the test to identify feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives. Additionally, this analysis addresses the requirement to evaluate “the relative severity of the remaining harm, after mitigation, to the protected activities, attributes, or features that qualify each Section 4(f) property for protection” and the “relative significance of each Section 4(f) property” under the overall least harm analysis.

FTA and the City solicited the views of the officials with jurisdiction, the SHPO and the ACHP, through distribution of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f) on May 31, 2013. Neither agency provided comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f).

**Common Comment 10:** Several commenters stated that karst formations would be damaged during construction of the Project or the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

**Common Response 10:** Section 3.5.3 of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) has been expanded to include discussion of karst formation (freshwater-eroded sub-surface limestone caves) in the study corridor. Extensive geotechnical testing during Final Design, including borings at pier locations, has been conducted for the Project. No karst formations have been identified that would be affected by the Project. In the Chinatown and Downtown areas, the Beretania Street Tunnel would be mauka of the alignment for the Project and travel through an area with coralline rock that could contain karst formations. A large karst formation does exist near the Koko Head limit of the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative.

**Common Comment 11:** Many of the comments received were outside the scope of the Supplemental EIS/4(f) or were previously addressed in the Final EIS/4(f) or ROD (RTD 2010, FTA 2011a).

**Common Response 11:** As explained in Section 1.1 of the Draft Supplemental EIS/4(f), the Supplemental EIS/4(f) has been prepared to address the Judgment and Partial Injunction of the United States District Court for the District of Hawai'i in *HonoluluTraffic.com, et al., vs. Federal Transit Administration, et al.*, Civ. No. 11-00307 AWT. The Judgment, filed December 27, 2012 requires the FTA and the City and County of Honolulu to comply with the District Court's Order on Cross-motions for Summary Judgment (Summary Judgment Order) dated November 1, 2012. The District Court's Summary Judgment Order granted the Motions for Summary Judgment of the FTA and the City with regard to the Plaintiffs' claims under the NEPA and the NHPA. The District Court granted the Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment with regard to three claims under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act [Section 4(f)]. The Summary Judgment Order concluded that the FTA and the City were required to conduct additional analyses (1) regarding whether the Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative was a feasible and prudent alternative under Section 4(f), (2) whether the Project would "constructively use" Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park under Section 4(f), and (3) the identification of traditional cultural properties (TCP) and, for any TCPs identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), complete a Section 4(f) analysis.

All substantive comments pertaining to the scope of the Supplemental EIS/4(f) are individually addressed in Appendix A to the Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). Please refer to the Final EIS/4(f) dated June 2010 regarding topics that are outside of the scope of this Final Supplemental EIS/4(f). The definition of the Project, including limits, technology, operating parameters, and station locations was discussed in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/4(f), effects on transportation in Chapter 3, and effects on the environment in Chapter 4.

## References

---

CFR 1989	Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). September 1989. 36 CFR 800. <i>Protection of historic and cultural properties.</i>
CFR 2007	Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Revised January 2007. 36 CFR 60.4. <i>National register of historic places: Criteria for evaluation.</i>
CFR 2008	Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). March 2008. 23 CFR 774 et seq. <i>Parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites</i> [Section 4(f)].
DBEDT 2011	State of Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT). 2011. <i>2010 State of Hawai'i Data Book</i>
DBEDT 2013	State of Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT). 2013. <i>2012 State of Hawai'i Data Book</i>
DPP 2002	City and County of Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP). 2002. <i>General plan for the City and County of Honolulu.</i>
DPR 2012	City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). December 5, 2012. Meeting notes.
DPR 2013a	City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). March 7, 2013. Meeting notes.
DPR 2013b	City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). May 22, 2013. Letter to Daniel Grabauskas at HART.
DTS 2006	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services (DTS). 2006. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project alternatives analysis conceptual plans.</i>
DTS 2006	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services (DTS). 2006. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project alternatives analysis report.</i>
DTS 2006	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services (DTS). 2006. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project final capital costing memorandum.</i>
DTS 2007	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services (DTS). 2007. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project Tunnels and Underground Stations Technical Memorandum.</i>
DTS 2007a	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services (DTS). 2007. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project Visual Impacts Technical Report.</i>

DTS 2007b	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services (DTS). 2007. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project Historic and Archaeological Technical Report</i> .
FHWA 2012	U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). July 2012. <i>Section 4(f) policy paper</i> .
Forrest City 2012	Forrest City. 2012. <i>Best and final offer mixed-use transit-oriented development project at 690 Pohukaina Street</i> .
FTA 2006	U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). May 2006. <i>Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment</i> .
FTA 2011	U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). January 2011. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project programmatic agreement</i> .
FTA 2011a	U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). January 2011. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project record of decision</i> .
FTA 2012	U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). June 2012. <i>Determination of eligibility and finding of effect on traditional cultural properties (TCPs) for the Honolulu Rail Transit Project (H RTP), Sections (Phases) 1-3, in compliance with Stipulation II of the Programmatic Agreement (PA)</i> .
FTA 2013	U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). August 2013. <i>Determination of eligibility and finding of effect for previously unidentified TCPs in Section 4</i> .
Halliday 1998	William R. Halliday. 1998. <i>History and Status of the Moiliili Karst, Hawaii</i> . Journal of Cave and Karst Studies 60(3): 141-145. December, 1998.
HART 2010	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). 2012. Final Archaeological Inventory Survey of Construction Phase I for the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project, Honouliuli, Hō'ae'ae, Waikele, Waipi'o, Waiawa, and Mānana Ahupua'a, 'Ewa District, Island of O'ahu TMK: [1] 9-1, 9-4, 9-6, 9-7 (Various Plats and Parcels).
HART 2012a	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). April 2012. <i>He Mo'olelo Aina-Traditions and storied places in the District of 'Ewa and Moanalua (in the District of Kona), Island of Oahu: A traditional cultural properties study-technical report</i> .
HART 2012b	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). April 2012. <i>Study to identify the presence of previously unidentified traditional cultural properties (TCP) in Sections 1-3 (West O'ahu Farrington Highway, Kamehameha Highway Guideway and Airport) for the Honolulu Rail Transit Project—Management Summary</i> .



HART 2012c	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). May 2012. <i>Determination of eligibility and finding of effect for previously unidentified TCPs in Sections 1-3.</i>
HART 2012d	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). 2012. Final Archaeological Inventory Survey for Construction Phase 2 of the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project, Waiawa, Mānana, Waimano, Waiau, Waimalu, Kalauao, 'Aiea, and Hālawā Ahupua'a, 'Ewa District, Island of O'ahu TMK: [1] 9-7, 9-8, and 9-9 (Various Plats and Parcels).
HART 2013a	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). 2013. Final Archaeological Inventory Survey for the Airport Section (Construction Section 3) of the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project, Hālawā and Moanalua Ahupua'a, 'Ewa and Honolulu Districts, O'ahu Island TMK Sections [1] 1-1 and 9-9 (Various Plats and Parcels).
HART 2013b	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). 2013. Final Archaeological Inventory Survey for the City Center Section (Construction Section 4) of the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project.
HART 2013c	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). March 2013. <i>He Mo'olelo 'Aina—Traditions and storied places in the District of Kona—Honolulu Region (Lands of Kalihi to Waikiki), Island of O'ahu: A traditional cultural properties study—technical report</i>
HART 2013d	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). April 2013. <i>Study to identify the presence of previously unidentified traditional cultural properties in Section 4 for the Honolulu Rail Transit Project management summary</i>
HART 2013e	Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART). September 2013. <i>Section 4(f) evaluation of archaeological sites for the Honolulu Rail Transit Project.</i>
HCDA 1981	Hawai'i Community Development Authority (HCDA). 1981. <i>Kaka'ako community development district plan.</i>
HCDA 2011	Hawai'i Community Development Authority (HCDA). November 2, 2011. 690 Pohukaina Transit Oriented Development Public Presentation Materials from website: <a href="http://hcda-public-consultation.org/portal/690_pohukaina_1/690_pohukaina_mixed_use_transit_oriented_development_1">http://hcda-public-consultation.org/portal/690_pohukaina_1/690_pohukaina_mixed_use_transit_oriented_development_1</a>
HCDA 2011	Hawai'i Community Development Authority (HCDA). September 2011. <i>Kaka'ako community development district mauka area plan.</i>
HDOH 2013	Hawai'i Department of Health's (HDOH) Hazard Evaluation and Emergency Response (HEER) branch. February 2013. <i>Programmatic EHE/EHMP Document Iwilei District Mauka.</i>
RTD 2009	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services, Rapid Transit Division (RTD). 2009. <i>Kaka'ako area-wide traffic study.</i>

RTD 2009a	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services, Rapid Transit Division (RTD). 2009. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project historic effects technical report</i> .
RTD 2010	City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services, Rapid Transit Division (RTD). 2010. <i>Honolulu high-capacity transit corridor project final environmental impact statement/section 4(f) evaluation</i> .
SHPD 1988	State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD). April 1988. State Register of Historic Places Listing Form, Mother Waldron Playground (the State Register uses the National Register of Historic Places listing form, but the property was not listed on the National Register).
SHPD 2012	State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD). July 2012. <i>Determination of eligibility and finding of effect for previously unidentified traditional cultural properties in Sections 1-3, 'Ewa Moku, Island of Oahu, TMK (1) various</i> .
SHPD 2012a	State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD). April 2012. <i>Request for Concurrence on a "no effect" determination for the Honolulu High-Capacity Rail Project Honouliuli, Ewa Moku, Oahu</i> .
SHPD 2013	State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD). September 2013. <i>NHPA Review, Section 106 Review of Stipulation II.A Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project Programmatic Agreement Determinations of Effect for Traditional Cultural Properties, City Center Kapalama, Kalihi, Kapalama, Nu'uuanu, Pauoa, Waikiki and Manoa Ahupua'a Kona Moku, Island of Oahu</i> .
USC 1966a	United States Code (USC). October 1966. 16 USC 470. <i>National historic preservation act of 1966 (NHPA) (Section 106)</i> .
USC 1966b	United States Code (USC). October 1966. 49 USC 303. <i>Department of Transportation Act—Policy on lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites [Section 4(f)]</i> .
USDOT 2012	United States Department of Transportation. Federal Highway Administration Office of Planning, Environment, and Realty Project Development and Environmental Review. July 20, 2012. Section 4(f) Policy Paper

## ***List of Preparers***

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title/EIS Role</b>
<b>Federal Transit Administration</b>	
Raymond Sukys	Director of Planning and Program Development, FTA Region 9
Ted Matley	Community Planner, FTA Region 9
Mary Nguyen	Environmental Protection Specialist, FTA Region 9
Elizabeth Patel	Environmental Protection Specialist, FTA Office of Planning and Environment
<b>Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation</b>	
Daniel A. Grabauskas	Executive Director and CEO
Elizabeth Scanlon	Director of Planning, Utilities, Permits and Right-of-Way
Faith Miyamoto	Chief Planner
Joanna Morsicato	Deputy Chief Planner
Jorge Felix	Planner
Anna Mallon	Planner
Bruce Nagao	Planner
Stanley Solamillo	Architectural Historian

Name	Education	Title/EIS Role	Years of Experience
<b>Parsons Brinckerhoff</b>			
Jason Bright	B.S. Anthropology, Utah State University; M.S. Anthropology, University of Utah	Supplemental EIS author	19
Ric Clark	B.A. Business Management, California State University-Fullerton	Cost estimation	32
Heather Fujioka	B.S., Mathematics, Willamette University; M.S., Statistics, Oregon State University	Travel forecasting	15
Barbara Gilliland, AICP	B.A., Urban and Regional Planning, Western Washington University; M.S., Intermodal Transportation Management, University of Denver	Planning director	28
Aki Marceau	B.A. Growth and Structure of Cities, Haverford College; M.R.P. City and Regional Planning, Cornell University	Supplemental EIS environmental analysis	2
Kanuji V. Parmar, AIA	M.Arch., University of California at Berkeley, CA	Architectural manager	44
Stephanie Roberts, AICP	B.A. Geography, Bowling Green State University; M.S. Urban Studies, Cleveland State University, Maxine Levin College of Urban Affairs	Supplemental EIS production	14
Clyde Shimizu, P.E.	B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa	Engineering design coordination	32
Josh Silva	Completing B.F.A. Interior Design, Chaminade University of Honolulu	Supplemental EIS production	7
Dorothy Skans	B.A., Visual and Speech Communications, University of Washington	Document Production Specialist	45
Andrew K. Smith, AICP	B.A., Government, Hamilton College; Master of City and Regional Planning (M.C.R.P.), Rutgers University	Supplemental EIS mapping and environmental analysis	10
Lawrence Spurgeon	B.S., Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, University of California at Berkeley; M.S.E., Environmental Engineering, University of Washington	Supplemental EIS author	19
Kara Swanson	BS Environmental Science, Iowa State University MS Environmental Sciences and Policy, The Johns Hopkins University	Supplemental EIS environmental analysis	12
Tom Willoughby	B.S. Administrative Services, Montclair State; MBA, Project/Construction Management, Golden Gate University	Scheduling and cost estimation	39



# ***List of Final Supplemental EIS/4(f) Recipients***

All recipients included in this list will receive either a hard copy or electronic copy of the Final Supplemental EIS/4(f).

Category	Contact	
<b><i>Federal Officials</i></b>		
Agencies	U.S. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	
	U.S. Army Corp of Engineers	
	U.S. Army Garrison Hawai'i	
	U.S. Coast Guard, 14th Coast Guard District	
	U.S. Department of Agriculture	
	U.S. Department of Justice, Appellate Section, Environmental & Natural Resources Division	
	U.S. Department of Justice, Natural Resources Section	
	U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service	
	U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service	
	U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Architectural Resources Team, Specific Great Basin Support Office	
	U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance	
	U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Station Pearl Harbor	
	U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration	
	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9, Federal Facilities Environmental Review Branch	
	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9, Pacific Islands Office	
	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Federal Activities, EIS Filing Section	
	U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency	
	U.S. General Services Administration, Region 9, Public Buildings Service, Portfolio Management Division	
	U.S. Geological Survey, Pacific Island Ecosystems Research Center	
	U.S. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	
	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	
U.S. District Court, District of Hawai'i	Alan C. Kay	Kevin S.C. Chang
	Barry M. Kurren	Leslie E. Kobayashi
	Helen Gillmor	Susan Oki Mollway
	J. Michael Seabright	
<b><i>U.S. Congressional Officials</i></b>		
U.S. Senators	Brian Schatz	Mazie Hirono
U.S. Representatives	Colleen Hanabusa	Tulsi Gabbard

Category	Contact	
<b>State of Hawai'i Officials</b>		
Governor	Neil Abercrombie	
Lt. Governor	Shan S. Tsutsui	
State Senators	Brian T. Taniguchi	Laura Theilen
	Brickwood Galuteria	Les Ihara, Jr.
	Clarence Nishihara	Maile S.L. Shimabukuro
	Clayton Hee	Malama Solomon
	David Y. Ige	Michelle N. Kidani
	Donna Mercado Kim	Mike Gabbard
	Donovan M. Dela Cruz	Ronald D. Kouchi
	Gilbert Kahele	Rosalyn Baker
	Gilbert S.C. Keith-Agaran	Russell E. Ruderman
	Glenn Wakai	Sam Slom
	J. Kalani English	Suzanne Chun Oakland
	Jill N. Tokuda	Will Espero
	Josh Green	
State House of Representatives	Jessica Wooley	Karen Leinani Awana
	Angus McKelvey	Karl Rhoads
	Aaron Ling Johanson	Ken Ito
	Bertrand Kobayashi	Kyle T. Yamashita
	Beth Fukumoto	Lauren Kealohilani Cheape
	Bob McDermott	Linda Ichiyama
	Calvin K.Y. Say	Marcus R. Oshiro
	Chris Lee	Mark J. Hashem
	Cindy Evans	Mark M. Nakashima
	Clift Tsuji	Mark Takai
	Cynthia Thielen	Mele Carroll
	Dee Morikawa	Nicole Lowen
	Della Au Belatti	Richard H.K. Onishi
	Denny Coffman	Richard Lee Fale
	Derek S.K. Kawakami	Rida T.R. Cabanilla
	Faye P. Hanohano	Romy M. Cachola
	Gene Ward	Roy M. Takumi
	Gregg Takayama	Ryan I. Yamane
	Henry J.C. Aquino	Scott K. Saiki
	Isaac W. Choy	Scott Nishimoto
	James Tokioka	Sharon E. Har
	Jo Jordan	Sharon Har
	John Mizuno	Sylvia Luke
	Joseph Souki	Takashi Ohno
	Justin H. Woodson	Tom Brower
	Kaniela Ing	Ty J.K Cullen

Category	Contact	
State of Hawai'i Agencies	Aloha Tower Development Corporation	
	Convention Center Authority	
	Department of Hawaiian Home Lands	
	Department of Land & Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Division	
	Hawai'i Community Development Authority	
	Hawai'i Community Development Authority, Kalaheo District	
	Housing Finance & Development Corporation	
	Legislative Reference Bureau	
	O'ahu Island Burial Council	
	O'ahu Metropolitan Planning Organization	
	Office of Environmental Quality Control	
	Office of Hawaiian Affairs	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Accounting & General Services	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Agriculture	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism, Energy, Resources, & Technology Division	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism, Land Use Commission	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Defense, Public Affairs Office	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Education	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Health, Environmental Planning Office	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Land & Natural Resources	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Land & Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Transportation	
	State of Hawai'i Department of Transportation, Airports Division Offices	
	State of Hawai'i Office of Planning	
	State of Hawai'i, Department of Budget and Finance Services	
	State of Hawai'i, Department of Education	
	State of Hawai'i, Disability and Communication Access Board	
	UHM Water Resources Research Center	
	University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering	
	University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Environmental Center	
	University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Marine Biology Specialization	
	University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Water Resources Research Center, Interim Director	
Commission on Transportation	Pete G. Pascua, Jr.,	Owen Miyamoto
	Eric Matduda	Ralph J.W.K. Hiatt
	John A Ervin	Shawn M. Smith
	Lester H. Fukuda	

Category	Contact	
<b>City and County of Honolulu</b>		
Mayor	Kirk Caldwell	
City Council	Ann Kobayashi	Joey Manahan
	Breene Harimoto	Kymberly Marcos Pine
	Carol Fukunaga	Ron Menor
	Ernest Y. Martin	Stanley Chang
	Ikaika Anderson	
Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation	Carrie K.S. Okinaga, Esq.	Ivan M. Lui-Kwan, Esq.
	Damien T.K. Kim	Keslie W.K. Hui
	Daniel A. Grabauskas	Michael D. Formby
	Donald G. Horner	Robert Bunda
	George I. Atta, FAICP, LEED AP, CEI	William "Buzz" Hong
	Glenn M. Okimoto, Ph.D	
City Departments	Board of Water Supply	
	Department of Community Services	
	Department of Design & Construction, City and County of Honolulu	
	Department of Environmental Services	
	Department of Facility Maintenance	
	Department of Parks & Recreation	
	Department of Transportation Services, City and County of Honolulu	
	Honolulu Fire Department	
Neighborhood Boards	Honolulu Police Department	
	Library, Department of Customer Services	
	McCully/Mō'ili'ili No. 8	
	Chair Alvin Au, Downtown No. 13	
	Chair Ariel De Jesus, Ewa No. 23	
	Chair Arnie Brady, Wai'ālae-Kāhala No. 3	
	Chair Charles A. Prentiss, Kailua No. 31	
	Chair Christopher Wong, Kalihi Valley No. 16	
	Chair David Henkin, Kāhala'u No. 29	
	Chair Dean Hazama, Neighborhood Board No. 35	
	Chair Dick Poirier, Mililani/Waipio/Melemanu No 25	
	Chair Donald Guerrero, Kalihi-Palama No. 15	
	Chair Eric Eads, Mānoa No. 7	
	Chair Greg Knudsen, Hawai'i Kai No. 1	
	Chair James "Kimo" Pickard, Pearl City No. 21	
	Chair Jeanne Ishikawa, Wahiawa no. 26	
	Chair John Steelquist, Neighborhood Board No. 10	
	Chair Johnnie Mae Perry, Waianae Coast No. 24	
	Chair Kathleen Pahinui, North Shore No. 27	



Category	Contact
	Chair Kekoa Ho, Waimanalo No. 32
	Chair Larry Hurst, Ala Moana/Kaka'ako No. 11
	Chair Linda Wong, Neighborhood Board No. 5
	Chair Lorene Godfrey, Neighborhood Board No. 18
	Chair Lyle Bullock, Jr., Kaimukī No. 4
	Chair Peter Kay, Kuliou/Kalani Iki No. 2
	Chair Philip S. Nemey Nu'uanu/Punchbowl No. 12
	Chair Rachel Orange, Palolo No. 6
	Chair Rito Saniatan, Waipahu No. 22
	Chair Robert Finley, Waikīkī No. 9
	Chair Roy S. Yanagihara, Kaneohe No. 30
	Chair Troy Cullen, Neighborhood Board No. 34
	Chair Verla Moore, Ko'olauloa No. 28
	Chair William B. Clark, 'Aiea No. 20
	Chair, Nānākuli-Maili No. 36
	Neighborhood Board No. 14
<b>Other</b>	
Colleges	Hawai'i Pacific University Honolulu Community College Library Kapi'olani Community College Library
	Leeward Community College Library University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Library University of Hawai'i West O'ahu, Library
Libraries	'Aiea Public Library Aina Haina Public Library DBEDT Library Ewa Beach Public & School Library Hawai'i Kai Public Library Hawai'i State Library Kahuku Public & School Library  Kahului Public Library Kailua Public Library Kaimukī Public Library Kalihi-Palama Public Library Kaneohe Public Library Kapolei Public Library Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped
	Liliha Public Library Mānoa Public Library McCully-Mō'ili'ili Public Library Mililani Public Library Pearl City Public Library Salt Lake-Moanalua Public Library University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Hamilton Library, Hawaiian Collection  Wahiawa Public Library Waialua Public Library Waianae Public Library Waikīkī-Kapahulu Public Library Waimanalo Public & School Library Waipahu Public Library
Newspapers	Honolulu Star Advertiser
Utilities	Hawaiian Electric Company Hawaiian Telcom The Gas Company Oceanic Time Warner Cable

### Groups/Organizations/Businesses

AARP and Concerned Elders of Waianae	Malama O Mānoa
Ahahui Siwila Hawai'i O Kapolei Hawaiian Civic Club	Mason Architects
AIA Honolulu	Merchant Street Hawaiian Civic Club
'Aiea Community Association	National Trust for Historic Preservation
Ala Moana Center	Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation
Ali'i Pauahi Hawaiian Civic Club	Nossaman LLP
American Planning Association	Pacific Guardian Life
American Society of Civil Engineers	Pacific Resource Partnership
American Society of Landscape Architects, Hawai'i	Pearl City Shopping Center
Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs	Pearl Harbor Hawaiian Civic Club
CBRE Consulting, Inc.	Pearlridge Center Management Office
Celtic Evangelical Church	Prince Kuhio Hawaiian Civic Club
Chamber of Commerce of Hawai'i	Princess Ka'iulani Hawaiian Civic Club
Chinatown Task Force	Royal Order of Kamehameha I
Conservation Council of Hawai'i	Sand Island Business Association
Decision Analysts Hawai'i, Inc.	Scott Hawai'i
Dentons US LLP	Servco Pacific Inc., Senior Vice President
E Noa Corporation	Sierra Club
Estate of James Campbell	Stop Rail Now
Eye of the Pacific, Guide Dogs and Mobility Services, Inc.	Tax Foundation of Hawai'i
FCH Enterprises, Chief Operating Officer	The Garden Club of Honolulu
Ford Island Properties, LLC, Vice President	The Hale O Na Ali'i O Hawai'i
Friends of Makakilo	The Hawai'i Chapter of the American Planning Association
General Contractors Association of Hawai'i	The Outdoor Circle
Hawai'i Bicycling League	The Sons & Daughters of the Hawaiian Warriors
Hawai'i Carpenters Union	UH System, Associate Vice President for Capital Improvements
Hawai'i Local Technical Assistance Program	UltraSystems
Hawai'i Lodging & Tourism Association	University of Hawai'i, Department of American Studies, Historic Preservation Certificate Program
Hawai'i Pilots Association	Waianae Hawaiian Civic Club
Hawai'i Stevedores, Inc.	Waikiki Hawaiian Civic Club
Hawai'i Teamsters and Allied Workers, Local 996	Ward Centers
Hawai'i Transportation Association	Wikoff Combs & Co. LLC
Hawai'i Visitor and Convention Bureau	
Hawaiian Civic Club of Ewa-Pu'uloa	
Hawaiian Civic Club of Honolulu	
Hawai'i's Thousand Friends	
Historic Hawai'i Foundation	
Honolulu Community Action Program, Inc.	
Honolulutrafic.com	
Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai'i Nei	
Kaka'ako Business and Landowners Association	
Kaka'ako Improvement Association	
Kalihi-Palama Hawaiian Civic Club	
Kamehameha Schools	
Kanehili Cultural Hui	
Kapolei Property Development LLC (Aina Nui Corp part of Campbell Estate)	
King Kamehameha Hawaiian Civic Club	
League of Women Voters of Honolulu	
Life of the Land	

**Other Recipients**

A. Lono Lyman	Fred Abe	Larry Lee	Robert Nickel
A. Talat	Garry P. Smith	Leatrice and Lawrence Fung	Robert Rodman
Aaron Erickson	Gary O'Donnell	Lennard Pepper	Robert Tellander
Alan E. Wickens	Glenn Oamilda	Lennette Hinton	Robert Ward
Alan Wang	George Lee	Leslie A. Among	Robert Wong
Alexander M. Tanji	Harry A. Huyler	Liane Briggs	Rodlyn Brown
Amy Kimura	Helen McCune	Lien Hilfer	Rodolfo Ramos
Andrew Sataraka	Helito Caraang	M. Wearstler	Ronald J. Verga
Anna Kerr	Henry Lee	Made Brunner	Rosita Sipirok-Siregr
Arnold E. Widder	Herb Rothouse	Malo Sua	Ruth Boyette
Asti Pilika	Herbert T.C. Loo	Malia Kaai-Barrett	Ruth Nakasone
Aulama Melei	Homer A. Chang	Margaret Murchie	Samoa Naea
Bart Travaglio	Howard Hoddich	Marilyn Michaels	Samuel M. Smith
Ben Robinson	Ian Capps	Mark R. James	Scott Miguel
Bob Kithau	Irwin and Michelina Mayer	Mark Taylor	Scott Wilson
Bryan Hoemig	Jack R. Corteway	Marsha Ninomiya	Sean Chu
Bryan Pineda	Jaime Kurosawa	Martinez Family	Sechyl Cain
C. Newman	James R. McManus	Maurice Morita	Sharon MacQuoid
Charles Carole	Jane Au	Max H. Watson	Sherman Kwock
Charles M. Ferrell	Janice Pechauer	Megan Giles	Shirly Lin
Choon James	Jay McWilliams	Michael Burton	Stanley Hamada
Chris Yannella	Jayson Reginaldo	Michael Golojuch, Jr.	Stephanie Fernandes
Chris Dolph	Jeffrey Gaskell	Michael P. Rethman	Sue Jansen
Clifford Mercado	Jeremy Lam	Michelle Matson	T.K. Chun
Cory Kot	Jerry D. Greer	Mike Lee	Taeotafe Melei
Daisy Murai	Jim Anthony	Mike Uechi	Tasha Kauihou
Daniel Walker	Jim Hayes	Mitsuru Takahashi	Taulagi Leano
Dave Bautista	Joan Bennett	Nadia Leano	Ted Taheny
David Rolf	Joanna Boyette	Nancy Hedlund	Terry Conlan
Debbie Stelmach	John Brizdle	Natlynn Cunningham	Tom Berg
Dennis Egge	John Bond	Pam Smith	Tom McLaughlin
Doug Pyle	John Kato	Pepe Maulupe	Tony Soon
Douglas Torres	Jon Anthony	Philip Blackman	Toshi Takata
Earl Arakaki	Judy Flores	Phillip T. Kishimori	Veronica Tuia
Ed Wagner	Joseph Ferraro	Ralph Bruinsslet, AIA	Victoria & Trudy Cannon
Eddielyn Fernandez	Karen Shimura	Ralph Fauata	Walker Kelley
Elaine Chu	Karen Sunahara-Teruya	Ray Leonard	Wayne Chun
Ellen Corrie	Katherine T. Kupukaa	Reid Hayashi	Wendy Lee
Epaferoti Sataraka	Katsumi Tanaka	Renee Ing	William Pelzer
Eve G. Anderson	Ken Settsu	Richard Kawano	Wynnie Hee
Evelyn Arkaki	Kenneth Tsumoto	Richard Mori	Y. Murata
Faanati Leano	Kevin Killeen	Richard Port	Young Kim
Fidelia Leano	Khistina Dejean	Richard Ubersax	Zoe Jarvis
Florita Pa	Kim Young	Richard Weimer	
Frank Genadio	Kioni Dudley	Robert Chang	
Frank Latino	Kirk Paterson	Robert Crone	
Frank Mak	Lane O. Sato	Robert Fowler	





## Index

---

access..... 10, 16, 41, 51, 65, 96  
aesthetic..... 96  
archaeological inventory survey ..... 59  
avoidance alternative .. 7, 11, 21, 41, 43,  
45, 47, 68  
Beretania Street Tunnel Alternative .... 7,  
17, 19, 75  
constructive use ..... 8, 9, 39, 104  
coordination..... 103, 107  
ecological intrusion..... 10  
feasible. 7, 9, 11, 12, 21, 47, 49, 68, 116  
historic property... 11, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43,  
57, 70, 84, 100, 119  
least overall harm..... 13, 17, 21, 68, 117

Mother Waldron Neighborhood Park... 7,  
19, 104, 103, 107, 117  
noise..... 9, 52, 65, 94  
prudent..... 7, 9, 11, 12, 21, 47, 68, 116  
public park..... 8, 32, 80  
*purpose and need* ..... 12, 14, 49  
Section 106 ..... 8, 11, 19, 32, 69, 73, 75,  
100, 119  
Section 4(f) properties ..... 17, 32, 77  
Section 4(f) uses ..... 9, 39  
Summary Judgment Order ..... 7, 21, 77,  
102  
*temporary occupancy*..... 9, 47, 94  
traditional cultural properties 7, 108, 115  
vibration..... 10, 96



[www.HonoluluTransit.org](http://www.HonoluluTransit.org) • [info@HonoluluTransit.org](mailto:info@HonoluluTransit.org) • (808) 566-2299